4175. df 14

A

PLEA

FOR

UNION

AND FOR

A FREE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL.

BEING

AN ANSWER

TO Dr. JAMIESON's REMARKS

On the late Tour of the Rev. R. Hill.

addressed to the

SCOTS' SOCIETY

FOR PROPAGATING THE GOSPEL AT HOME.

BY ROWLAND HILL, A.M.

LATE OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE, AND MINISTER OF SURRY CHAPEL.

And there ran a young man, and told Moses, and said Eldad and Medad do prophecy in the camp. And Moses said unto him, Enviest thou for my sake? would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, *and* that the Lord would put his spirit upon them. *Old Testament.*

Love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous. *New Testament.*

London

PRINTED BY A. Paris, ROLLS'-BUILDINGS, FETTER-LANE.

And sold at Surry Chapel; also by T. Williams, Stationer's court; T. Chapman, Fleet Street; Ogle, Great Turnstile; T. Dickie, Bow Lane, Ogle and Guthrie, Edinburgh; and Ogle Glasgow.

1800.

Price One Shilling.

BRITISH MUSEUM

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Public may understand from the date in the Preface, that these Remarks were finished for the press many months ago. I being in the country, transmitted the MS. to be carried through the press to the care of a judicious friend. Soon after he had received them he was seized with a dangerous illness, and afterwards a relapse, which had very nearly carried him to the grave. The work was therefore entirely suspended till my return to town a few weeks ago; since then I have not been inattentive to the business of the publication. By this delay, however, I have had an opportunity to add some Notes to the pamphlet which I should have been sorry to have omitted.

ERRATA.

Page 14 line 3 *for* taking *read* raking
—— 40 — 3 *dele* ministers
—— 44 — 9 *after* were *add* able
—— 55 — 8 *dele* then

TO THE

EDINBURGH SOCIETY

FOR

PROPAGATING THE GOSPEL AT HOME.

MY DEAR BRETHREN,

THOUGH it is by no means my wish to continue a controversy which I never intended to excite, yet you may admit the necessity of sending these few pages to the press, not as an Answer to Dr. Jamieson individually considered, but as a Vindication of ourselves, and an answer to that body of people with whom he is connected, and for whose cause he evidently writes.

Never, surely, was any poor Society so formidably attacked by such opposite parties at the same time. Can Scotland believe it, the Established Church and the Antiburghers are one in the same opposition against us? The latter, by the Act of their general Synod in May last, have commenced open hostilities upon us.

Now it will appear upon comparison, that the whole of the Doctor's pamphlet is but the echo of that decree of their "*Reformed Presbytery*," as they call themselves; making his address to me the mean of con-

veying their sentiments to the public. As 600 copies only of their Act of Synod were ordered to be printed, the circulation consequently cannot have been very general; I therefore print their Act as a Preface to this publication: this, while it throws considerable light upon the subject, gives greater publicity to a paper not less curious in its way, than "the Pastoral Admonition" of the Established Church.

ACT of the GENERAL ASSOCIATE SYNOD.

Edinburgh, 8th May 1799.

'THE SYNOD, finding, from papers before them, that, in sundry places, various abuses prevail among persons of our communion, by *promiscuous hearing*, not only of Ministers belonging to churches from which we are in a state of separation, but likewise of *Lay-Preachers*;—by our people attending public meetings, where private persons encroach upon the business of the Ministerial Office—and by the manifest abuse of Sabbath-Evening Schools: The SYNOD agree in renewing their Act of the 2d of May 1798, with the following corrections and amendments.

'The SYNOD, therefore, agree in declaring, That, as *lay-preaching*, (or preaching by persons not invested with any ecclesiastical office) has no warrant in the Word of GOD; no person in the communion of

'the

'the Secession Church ought to countenance the public ministrations of such persons: and as this SYNOD have always considered it as their duty to testify against *promiscuous communion*, no person under their inspection can, consistently with their principles, attend upon, or give countenance to, the public ministrations of those who bear office in ANY church against which we have *lifted up a testimony* in a state of separation from *her*.

'With regard to Sabbath-Evening Schools, though the SYNOD admit, that they may be the means of doing good among the rising generation, if under proper regulations; yet the SYNOD judge, That no persons *in subjection to them* can, consistently with their principles, send their children to such schools, or otherwise give countenance to them,—if in these schools, discourses are delivered, tending to *encroach upon the work of the ministry*,—if there is such an attendance of multitudes as gives to the school the appearance of an assembly met for public worship,—if any thing is done or taught in these schools inconsistent with the duty of the Sabbath-day,—if the attendance of children upon these schools shall interfere with the duty of parents to instruct their own children,—or if any thing in the character of the teacher gives reason

'to

'to *suspect*, that the *principles* or *morals* of 'the children may be *corrupted* by them.

'The SYNOD, therefore, hereby warn all 'persons under their *inspection*, against of- 'fending in the above respects: And they 'appoint, that if any persons in our con- 'nexion shall be found to do so, the Pres- 'bytery or Session, under whose inspection 'they are, shall deal with them according 'to the degree of their offence.

'Extracted by

'DAVD BLACK, *Assi. Syn. Clk.*'

The principal design of the above paper is evidently to enforce their contracted discipline, by forbidding people, IN SUBJECTION TO THEM (as their expression is) to attend upon the ministry of others, though they should be men of the most holy and evangelical description.

Thus they presume to lord over the consciences of their hearers, while their own wretched decretals * are to be urged, however contradictory to the whole spirit and design of the word of God itself.

* Besides a multitude of Acts of Synod, the terms of communion with them, it seems by a late pamphlet from Glasgow, are multiplied to no less than 12 publications, containing 508 pages, and 3048 distinct propositions, allowing 6 propositions to each page: what work all this must be to the memory and conscience of an upright Antiburgher!

The

The phrases they employ are very remarkable: all friendly intercourse in public administrations is by them called "PROMISCUOUS COMMUNION;" and they have "LIFTED UP A TESTIMONY against," and are *even now* IN A STATE OF SEPARATION from every Christian church upon earth beside their own. In this shocking unchristian spirit they even presume to glory; or, as Dr. Jamieson says, "Thus the Seceders blush not to avow*." And it is evident, the exercise of this spiritual dominion over the consciences of their hearers, is too frequently exemplified. The pamphlet quoted in the note gives a fearful instance of the effects of this spirit, as exhibited against some of their members for the *sin* of *Promiscuous hearing*, on our late Missionary exertions. That a set of people called Christians, and many of whom I believe are deservedly so called, should give over to the devil, by excommunication, members of their body, for merely attending the preaching of the gospel, by ministers of different denominations, united to promote the most glorious cause which ever actuated the human mind, is to me a solecism in Christianity not to be understood.

In their manifesto against us, they have also not only prejudged the liberty granted in the Word of God, that it is the duty and privilege of others, besides ordained ministers, if blessed with ability, to instruct the

* P. 30.

ignorant;

ignorant; but have adopted the most avowed opposition, with their ancient mother (though they on other occasions treat her as the worst of strumpets), against the Sabbath schools, not only in language high and priestly, but have even *cruelly* insinuated, that the very principles and morals of the children *may* be *corrupted* by your institution.

My predilection in favour of that body of Dissenters called *the Relief*, from the liberal principles originally adopted by them, was sufficiently conspicuous in my last publication: nor did I mean the least reflection against them as a body, by a former observation, in supposing that there might be some inadvertently admitted into that connexion, less pure and spiritual than others. I supposed that such intrusions were scarcely avoidable, from the liberality of their principles; and if the remark was too general, I retract it.

They have, however, grieved us in return, by acting in some respects, in conjunction with the Antiburghers, and so contrary to their own principles, in giving their vote against what is commonly called Lay Preaching. Yet I am informed that this decision was highly offensive to many among them, whose characters and dispositions are truly ornamental to the gospel of Christ. I bless God, however, in my last Northern Tour I found an increasing spirit of candour and liberality among many (though some exceptions

tions must be expected); and I gratefully acknowledge, that among the Burgher Seceders I received many proofs of their friendship and affection.

I bless God for the growing liberality of sentiment which subsists among them; yet while under the various passions belonging to the corrupted mind, we are in danger from every quarter. While therefore we are directed that "our moderation should be known unto all men," and while our Christian liberty is promoted thereby, may we be under a holy guard "not to use that liberty as a cloke to the flesh!"

I shall leave Dr. Jamieson however in full possession of his own conceit, that there can be no real commuuion but as that communion is confined to a mere sect. He shall, as he pleases, extract all the sweets he may conceive to be enjoyed from the recollection that all his beloved flock are Antiburgher Seceders, while we take the consolation that union with Christ is the only term of communion with us. These he may call "*loose* ideas of church fellowship*" Yet we may be liberal though not loose; and I humbly trust the accusation of being really loose in admitting graceless characters to the table belongs *not less* to our opponents than to ourselves.

Even among the *Antiburghers* themselves, many begin seriously to recoil at this abominable anathematizing spirit: we still there-

* P. 37.

fore

fore rejoice over all that is good among this people, notwithstanding their *uplifted testimony* against us: and are happy that it is no sin in us to hear them, though it is a *sin with them* to attend on us.

I lament that Doctor Jamieson is my *nominal* opponent on this occasion. I respect him as a real Christian; and, detached from his Antiburgherism, a sound and able divine. I mean not therefore the least disrespect, in submitting my answer to his remarks to your approbation, as I judge this to be no private controversy between the Doctor and me, but between us and the Antiburghers. I also firmly believe, that all the severe words which may have slipt from his pen, arose in the heat of controversy, which misleads and heats the judgments of the best of men, and gives them cause to lament over, and correct themselves, in the cooler hours of reflection.

I remain,

My dear Brethren,

Yours affectionately in Christ,

R. HILL.

WOTTON UNDEREDGE,
October 20, 1799.

A

PLEA

FOR

UNION.

DR. JAMIESON, an Antiburgher Minister of Edinburgh, has lately printed some remarks on my Journal. I once thought to be silent, whoever might attack; but as the Doctor *writes much*, and *says little*, a few observations may settle the whole dispute between us. The Doctor's pamphlet appears chiefly designed to expose my ignorance and misrepresentations of the method of taking their Covenant; and to produce his objections against free and open communion among Christians, and against what is commonly called *Lay-preaching:*—an expression so well calculated to accomplish *certain ends and designs*, that it stimulates me to a farther investigation of this interesting subject.

The Doctor gives me credit, that I had no intention to misrepresent the Seceders; and yet represents me as "blackening them with my brush," as he calls it, "and endeavouring to expose the Seceders to ridicule *:" while, at the same time, he passes over all the respectful things I said of the Secession; though it was my evident design

* See page 29. 32.

to speak all the good in my power relative to that body; only lamenting the evil which was intermixed with the good.

I mentioned my objections against the Covenant, as having in it many bitter persecuting clauses; and that it was absolutely designed, by the original fabricators of that law, to return a persecution on their persecuting opponents: this the Dr. fully and universally admits *. Every attempt, therefore, to soften these abominable, revengeful clauses, is only perverting the meaning of words from their original design. While thus my Opponent so completely gives up the cause of persecution, does he not expose the inconsistency of a party in taking, till just of late, an oath, evidently designed to promote it †? Who then will follow him through all his waste of words, about another meaning for the word *extirpation*, and a better light for the words *suppress* and *overcome*, when the matter so plainly speaks for itself? Even among themselves, the phrase is at last acknowledged to be bad, and the doctrine of persecution is now entirely disowned.‡

The

* P. 11, 12, &c.

† For the following Note the Author stands indebted to a friend, who was himself, in time past, an Antiburgher Minister; and supposes, therefore, its authority will be admitted: "It is indeed true, that the Seceders do not formally swear to the Solemn League and Covenant; but it is equally true, that they testify their adherence to it in *their Covenant*, under the solemnity of an oath. Their bond is called 'The bond for renewing our covenants,' and is, in fact, a renovation of them. We must therefore judge, that they approve every point of the Solemn League, until they declare publicly what part of it they renounce."

‡ "It is worthy of remark," says the same judicious friend, just referred to, "that it was owing to the Presbyterians, when in favour, denying to their Independent brethren a comprehension in the establishment, or even a toleration, notwithstanding they

The Dr. shall also possess his own interpretation of that absurd phrase, of avowing not only the same things for themselves, but for their posterity after them. Let common sense determine the controversy between us.

Thus, throughout several long pages, the Dr. has confirmed me in my opinion, not only respecting the original design of the Covenant, but of the infinite mischief it has done; having been swallowed in the gross, with all its *red-hot* phrases, till about three years ago.

But now, a little apology for the grand blunder of my book. It seems these persecuting clauses have been rejected by the Antiburgher Synod, in May 1796; that is, just two years before I wrote my Journal: but how far, and by what means, the publication and circulation of this event took place, the Dr. is *not so minute* in his explanation, as on other occasions; for not one in ten, if one in twenty, or in fifty, knows any thing of this event, to the present hour. Whether it was

they offered to receive the Confession of Faith, and conform to the Directory, and most other things in the *then* reformation, which eventually proved the overthrow of their covenanted work, which had cost so much blood. Here, also, we may find the origin of that separating, persecuting principle, which actuates the Antiburghers and reformed Presbytery in their ecclesiastical proceedings to the present day. Like their fathers, they are for a compulsory uniformity, without sufficient tenderness to scrupulous consciences. And they do not confine this to the plain dictates of Scripture, but extend it to things that have evidently no foundation there. Those who are willing to be cured of this distemper, would do well to read Neale's History of the Puritans, particularly vol. 3d. especially as that work is recommended by Dr. Jamieson himself. Here they will see the origin of those human inventions which are palmed on them for the ordinances of God; and will find the cause of liberty of conscience, and Christian charity, more ably pleaded than in most publications."

deemed most prudent, to extract these bitter persecuting clauses from their Covenant, without creating an alarm respecting a dangerous innovation, I presume not to say; but I think the Dr. should fairly have told us, how far this matter was really *published*, as well as *printed*, or what he and his denomination call *publishing* on these occasions; and then the public, I dare say, would candidly determine, whether the fault of misrepresentation is to rest on me, or whether the Antiburgher Synod ought not to bear the blame for not giving sufficient publicity to the event, even among their own body. Had they followed the conduct of the late *redoubtable* General Assembly, in making this matter as notorious among them, as they did their pastoral *harrangue*, they would have put it out of my power to have said *quite so much* against the bigotry and inconsistency of the Antiburghers.

Be it known unto all men, however, from the date hereof, That all the political persecuting clauses in the Covenant no longer exist. That old rusty spiritual sword of state, forged in the year 1643, is now no more to be worn by the Antiburgher Seceders. Nor will we despair, that a reformation thus begun, may have a happy issue; and that they will *peep* a little deeper into matters; and instead of *rummaging* over their "Acts and Testimonies," and the trumpery decretals of their Synods, resort for better lessons, to the pure word of God, that they may from thence learn, how far they do right, to treat all other assemblies of their Master's children, however holy, zealous, and useful, with contempt and excommunication. To be sure, it has a heartless appearance, that this said Covenant should have been sworn to, for more than a century and a half, without

any

any amendment, till about three years ago; we will not despair, however, that their future progress in reformation may be more rapid. But while the Dr. mentions the secret murmurs among themselves, against this business *, what is it more than saying right, and doing wrong? "But why" says Dr. J, † "have you not included the Church of Scotland, and other bodies of Presbyterians?" quoting at the same time a persecuting clause, which sadly disgraces the Confession of Faith. Now, this gentleman might have supposed, that the glaring inconsistency, superadded by the Seceders in taking the Covenant, struck me the more forcibly; while it might have been admitted, by a candid controversialist, that I had no other view in mentioning the Confession of Faith, but an eulogium, so far as it respected the fundamental *doctrines of the gospel*; yet the Dr. and I are quite agreed, that the principles of persecution are abominable in religion. He seems, indeed, ill at ease, on account of the reflections made on the conduct of the Antiburghers, as it relates to their treatment of their brethren, the Burghers. He tells us, "an oath is at all times a serious business ‡." And so say I; and consciences deserve a little serious attention as well as oaths; and while the Antiburghers have been so grievously inconsistent, in taking the Covenant, with all its persecuting clauses, till very lately, they might have shewn a little more tenderness to the consciences of their Burgher brethren, as it respected their interpretation of taking an oath. I should hope, after all that has been written on each side of the question, it may be acknowledged, that many of the Burghers submitted to the oath with as much integrity before God, as the Antiburghers manifested in rejecting it; and had the Antiburghers attended to

* P. 16. 20, &c. † P. 22. ‡ P. 23.

the

the Bible, which has given so many lovely displays of Christian forbearance, respecting "meats offered to idols," and "keeping holidays," &c. they had not given such a wretched triumph to the enemies of all religion whatever, by their unchristian violence against their brethren, so near akin to themselves. But the Dr. gives his readers to understand, that while I thus publicly exclaim against the Seceders, for want of brotherly love among themselves, I unhappily prove a want of the same love in my own heart, "by taking up all the differences which have taken place in that country for more than a century." Reader, observe how I am questioned on this subject. "Have the two classes of Seceders manifested MUCH virulence and acrimony of spirit *?" But if my *wicked* hands have only overturned all the water, where there was not MUCH fire, I have not overturned MUCH water, nor done MUCH mischief after all. It is only like destroying all the love between a man and his wife, where there was not *much hatred.*

The Dr. goes on: "Can the revival of the affair of the excommunication, which has been in a great measure *dormant* for many years, operate as an anodyne?" Though this seems to put rather a better face upon his awkward apology, (for the worst of enemies, when they drop asleep, cannot hate one another till they awake); yet how are these matters "in a measure dormant?" Does an Antiburgher at any time take a poor excommunicated brother Burgher into his pulpit? Are their members allowed any, even occasional communion among them? Are there any overtures making, to drop the unhappy dispute? When I re-

* P. 34.

ceive

ceive further information on this subject, then the brilliant thought of the Dr's. *waggish* friend will appear more to the purpose, that I had treated the Seceders as fighting dogs; but this *wag* should have remembered, that as a friend to peace, I wrote, to prevent a set of good people from contending on those mere dry *bones* which they so eagerly surround. My advice was, to drop the contention, love one another, and seek the manna of the kingdom. This is not setting fighting dogs together by the ears, but directing the children to agree among themselves.

Not only in this, but in other instances, I find the Dr. not a little out of temper. He remarks*, I said, "the Seceders separated from many, precisely of the same faith." No, says my Antagonist, "Archbishop Laud, and many others, were avowed Arminians." True, Dr.; but I could still mention thousands, and ten thousands, precisely of the same faith with the Seceders, from whom they separated. There was an unhappy controversy in *those* days, which does not subsist in these. This apology he acknowledges I made for them; but for the Dr. and his adherents, of the *present day*, as to the *original* design of the Covenant, no such apology can be admitted.

On the most trivial occasions, the Dr. is equally severe. I notice, Toads are innocent creatures, therefore should not be wantonly destroyed; the Dr. is also offended with this remark; and observes from thence, that I should encourage "a locustry, a snakery, or even a place of retirement for bugs." Thus, while I evidently meant only to plead for creatures which are innocent and useful, I am made to defend the cause of reptiles dangerous and destructive.

* P. 5.

Again,

Again, because I said an old woman is superstitious if she forebode things by the ghastly appearance of a toad, the Dr. says I must *strain hard* to prove my point*. I think the point is proved if I *strain easy*, or even if I do not *strain at all*: but I hardly think it is consistent with the character of this learned Antiburgher Dr. thus to trifle with the public cause.

When I notice the inconsistency of the Seceders in swearing to what they never can accomplish, my Antagonist, with all the gravity of a judge, exclaims, "This is a serious charge indeed; but this is not all: you charge us as engaged in the solemnity of an oath with a bloody, a persecuting design †." Surely the Dr. read my book, *the wrong end upwards*; I fully admitted they had *no such design*, and therefore only meant to expose the *inconsistency* of their oath.

When I mention the inconsistency of the Seceders in adopting the persecuting language of Popery, the Dr. supposes I mean to represent the Seceders, not only as *fools, but as bloody and as ignorant as Papists themselves* ‡. But he will not obtain credit for all this; my aim was to represent the Seceders as being on the whole, the best people in the North; but disfigured by bigotry, through their attachment to a Covenant so abominably injurious to the spirit of universal love among the disciples of Christ. The Dr. says ‡ I talk with a sneer at the separation occasioned by the Burgess Oath §. I grant sneers are not arguments: but I question if my readers were so quicksighted as the Dr. to discern a sneer, where none certainly was intended.

* P. 15. † P. 19. ‡ P. 21. § P. 22.

The

But on what occasion do I sneer *? The rigid conduct of the Antiburghers the Dr. himself virtually censures, by observing, "There is ground to believe that the generality of those who succeeded them would not have gone so far †." But

* P. 22.

† Dr. J. indeed (p. 24. near the bottom), seems to insinuate, that their party had never been so strait-laced as we pretend; but there is a great fallacy here, says my Antiburgher friend above quoted, if we do not attend closely to Dr. Jamieson's expressions. From what is here said, an ordinary Reader would be apt to imagine, that an approbation of the censures is not made a term of Ministerial Communion among the Antiburghers. But the Dr. does not say this; he only says, that an approbation of "*this deed*," i. e. the higher Excommunication is not so. It ought however to be observed, that it is required of Ministers and Elders at their ordination, and of Preachers at their receiving licence, that they approve of the separation of the Breach 1747—of the new Constitution—of the very severe censure of immediately depriving the Brethren of their judicative power, which was a partial deposition—and in fine, it is required of them to approve of acts and deeds then passed, called *A Testimony*, in which the censures, afterwards inflicted, are threatened; and to promise to *adhere unto, and maintain* the same; that is, to prosecute the ends thereof, by joining in the Censures if called thereto. See Mr. Gib's Display of the Secession Testimony, vol. ii. 73—80. Acts and Proceedings of the Associate Synod, April 1747, pages 6. 7, 8, 9. 19, 20. 21. compared with the 12th question of the Formula. Display, vol. i. p. 15. Thus an act that was passed in a fit of madness, making this a term of Ministerial Communion, has been continued as a yoke of iron on the neck of the Antiburgher churches for fifty years past. The tame and passive disposition of that body as to the authority of their courts, and their swallowing any thing that they impose upon them, may be seen in this; that there is no *known instance* among the Antiburghers of any Minister or Preacher objecting to this, except one Minister in the North, who was ordained among them near thirty years ago, who absolutely refused this question. The person who assents to this formula, must confirm his assent by an appeal to the judgment-seat, equivalent to an oath. The words are, "All "these things you promise and engage unto, through grace, as "you will be answerable at the coming of our Lord Jesus "Christ, with all his saints, and as you would desire to be "found among that happy company at his glorious appearing."

if they went too far, why do not they who succeed them retract the rash conduct of their predecessors? Why should the highest church censure still exist against them? which is alone proper to be inflicted on those whose doctrines are the most erroneous, and whose conduct has been the most abominable? The Dr. therefore went quite far enough in merely asking the question, "Have the Seceders manifested MUCH virulence and acrimony of spirit?" Nor can the cause be "*in a measure dormant*," while houses of opposition stand erected throughout Scotland at large, without the most distant overtures for Christian forbearance and love; nor is it possible that any printed remarks can expose them before the public, while, by this notorious fact, they continue to expose themselves.

I illustrated the dreadful effects of this bigotry, by the story respecting the Erskines *. This I delivered precisely to the Public, as it was delivered to me from the mouth and pen of a Scottish Dr. of the Established Church; and this story I find, in a measure contradicted, and considerably altered by the pen of our Antiburgher Dr. Now which of the two Doctors is the most correct it is not with me to determine. We will suppose, however, the balance of correctness weighs in favour of the latter, as he was the most likely to be best acquainted with the story, and the Dr. shall take it just as he has related it. "John was not the Son, but the Nephew. For a time he was with the Burghers, afterwards joined the Antiburghers, and then voted for the excommunication of his Uncle." John, while a Burgher, conceived the Burgher's oath might be taken with great uprightness and integrity. When he commenced Antiburgher, what was *only* a sin of igno-

* P. 25.

rance,

rance, while he was in sentiment with the Burghers, is now the *most intolerable crime*, deserving the highest church censure. Forgetting therefore the spirit of forbearance, once needed for himself, no wonder that his intolerant spirit was steeled against his Uncle, and that to so high a pitch, that while the rest of his party would have dispensed with his vote, his new Antiburgher conscience wanted no such tenderness.

And this appears from the Dr.'s further corrected story, which seems, notwithstanding, a little incorrect. "A woman outrageously accused John in the street in these words: 'How could you sit in your Synod, and give your honest Father [before, he was the Uncle] to the devil?' He gravely replied, 'Woman, when I sit in the courts of Christ [*i. e.* an Antiburgher Synod], I sit as no man's son.' And this speech, contrasting *humanity* with *christianity*, the Dr. seems highly to approve of; for, referring to the blessing of the tribe of Levi, he quotes, *Who said unto his father and to his mother, I have not seen him; neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor knew his own children; for they have observed thy word, and kept thy covenant**. The Dr. when he quotes scripture in general, quotes it as a Christian, but this text he quotes as a partisan; and it is in such a view only, that the Dr. could have adopted a quotation from the Old Testament, approving the slaughter of three thousand men †, for the idolatry committed in worshipping the golden calf, to justify what Mr. John Erskine did, in voting for the excommunication, not only of his Father *or* Uncle ‡, but also of hun-

* Deut. xxxiii. 8, 9. † Exod. xxxii. 28.

‡ What between the Dr. and the *outrageous woman* so flatly contradicting each other, it does not appear whether he was the Uncle or Father, after all.

 dreds

dreds of his brethren in Christ, for the crime of Burgherism, which he himself in no wise esteemed criminal but a little while before.

Let the Dr. then have his own story, in his own way; and whether the wretched spirit of Antiburgher bigotry be not just as conspicuous from the Dr.'s corrected story as from that printed in the Journal, shall be left with the public to determine.

Now, nothing is more evident throughout the word of God than that mutual forbearance should be exercised among the disciples of Christ. We cannot, in this imperfect state of things, precisely think alike: if even in the earliest ages of the church, differences subsisted on lesser matters, yet how strictly forbidden were they to suffer these differences to break the bonds of brotherly love, and to create separation between those who were all one in Christ! Still what pains does Dr. Jamieson take from the same Bible to prove the contrary! Even a command for unity is by him perverted as an argument for separation; we must, in his sense of the text, "all speak the same things, that there may be no division among us," as a plea that we may still divide. And again, "That we may be perfectly joined together." Not supposing that a disputatious separating spirit is forbidden by that word, he concludes, that text will bear them and others out in a shameful and entire separation from their brethren; strangely supposing that all this spirit of division is right, because we are to be united "in the same mind, and in the same judgment *."

Can the Reader believe his own eyes when I present before him some other sacred passages,

* P. 37.

tortured

tortured to support the same spirit of division and separation? Speaking of Mr. Whitefield, the Dr. says, "We may believe that a man's ministry is attended with life and power, and that in many respects he is a bright luminary, and yet have no *scriptural warrant to countenance his ministrations* *." Can any thing equal the unguarded and evil tendency of this assertion, except indeed the argument by which he attempts to support it from the word of God? "I may," says he, "withdraw from one as walking disorderly, and still count him a brother." We will refer to the account given of these disorderly brethren, 2 Thess. iii. 6. There we are told, that Paul, though *in holy orders*, "wrought with labour and travail night and day, that he might not be chargeable to any of them;" while the disorderly brethren among the *Laity* were idle, prating busybodies, "working not at all." Is this text applicable to Mr. Whitefield as a disorderly brother? We next notice another parallel passage, as it respects the same characters from whom we are to withdraw: "I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such a one no not to eat." Can the Dr. mean this passage as being a proper one to serve the same purpose? or will he try again if he can make some other passages of scripture bear him and his denomination out, in their spirit of shameful separation from all others? and yet the Dr. asserts that such were still *brethren in Christ*, charged as they were with the most impure crimes; and then further inquires, "If thus from every brother, why not from every church?" Am I then to suppose a church guilty of such

* P. 40.

iniquitous

iniquitous conduct, is still to be esteemed *a church of Christ?*

Can we be surprized if the Dr. be not a little unfortunate in his quotations from scripture on a point like this? Love is the grand new command of the gospel. "From hence shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another." Now, what has love to do with all these separations, divisions, and excommunications. Yet again, the Dr. refers to the word of God, and on that ground, I trust, I am always happy to meet him; still relying more to sound than to sense, he gives us a *strip* of a reference from 2 Cor. vi. 17. "Come out from among them, and be ye separte." Thus quoted, it stands a mere spiritual nose of wax, and as the Dr. has applied it, he has made it the shape of his own nose exactly; but truth will not be injured if we review the passage at large. Now the Bible design of this text is to direct *christians* to keep themselves separate from the *heathen* world. But the Dr.'s design in producing a mutilated part of it was to vindicate the Antiburghers in separating from the *christian* world. The Dr., though explicit enough in other matters, leaves the following part of the text to rest in the back ground. "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" Thus, because christians are to be separated from infidels, therefore they, of the Dr.'s denomination, do right to separate from all their brethren in Christ; and to complete the business, sport with the solemn sentence of excommunication against their near neighbours the Burghers themselves.

In the very same paragraph, wehave another instance

stance of this strange Antiburgher logic, " This command," says the Dr. " come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, includes the same idea. It immediately refers to the church of Rome, but it is applicable to every church that, like this Babylon, refuses to be healed." So that, because Protestants are to have no communion with Papists, Protestants are to have no communion with each other; and why not? Because *they refuse to be healed* *. What a monstrous quotation! So that all the Protestant churches upon earth *have refused to be healed,* and consequently, deserve all the awful plagues denounced against Rome, the Scotch Antiburghers excepted, with whom alone the sovreign balm for a complete healing is to be found, or else why does the Dr. quote it. For in no other possible point of view can it be applicable to his purpose.

Will the candid Reader forgive me, if, while dealing with such arguments, I lose a degree of patience? Have I not this patience still to exercise, when the Dr. as a further argument for all the contractedness of the Seceders, notwithstanding they have lately renounced the spirit of persecution, quotes those words of our Lord, " Teaching them to observe *all things* I have commanded you †?" Here he supposes the little differences which have exercised the minds of some of the Lord's best disciples, after their most devout attention to the word of God for direction, were among the *all things* commanded by the God of patience, peace, and love; and for such supposed offences, giving them an authority to excommunicate each other. Were not the things there referred to, the essential doctrines of the gospel? and yet this text,

* P. 42. † P. 40

as

iniquitous conduct, is still to be esteemed *a church of Christ?*

Can we be surprized if the Dr. be not a little unfortunate in his quotations from scripture on a point like this? Love is the grand new command of the gospel. "From hence shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another." Now, what has love to do with all these separations, divisions, and excommunications. Yet again, the Dr. refers to the word of God, and on that ground, I trust, I am always happy to meet him; still relying more to sound than to sense, he gives us a *strip* of a reference from 2 Cor. vi. 17. "Come out from among them, and be ye separte." Thus quoted, it stands a mere spiritual nose of wax, and as the Dr. has applied it, he has made it the shape of his own nose exactly; but truth will not be injured if we review the passage at large. Now the Bible design of this text is to direct *christians* to keep themselves separate from the *heathen* world. But the Dr.'s design in producing a mutilated part of it was to vindicate the Antiburghers in separating from the *christian* world. The Dr., though explicit enough in other matters, leaves the following part of the text to rest in the back ground. "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" Thus, because christians are to be separated from infidels, therefore they, of the Dr.'s denomination, do right to separate from all their brethren in Christ; and to complete the business, sport with the solemn sentence of excommunication against their near neighbours the Burghers themselves.

In the very same paragraph, wehave another instance

stance of this strange Antiburgher logic, " This command," says the Dr. " come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, includes the same idea. It immediately refers to the church of Rome, but it is applicable to every church that, like this Babylon, refuses to be healed." So that, because Protestants are to have no communion with Papists, Protestants are to have no communion with each other; and why not? Because *they refuse to be healed* *. What a monstrous quotation! So that all the Protestant churches upon earth *have refused to be healed*, and consequently, deserve all the awful plagues denounced against Rome, the Scotch Antiburghers excepted, with whom alone the sovreign balm for a complete healing is to be found, or else why does the Dr. quote it. For in no other possible point of view can it be applicable to his purpose.

Will the candid Reader forgive me, if, while dealing with such arguments, I lose a degree of patience? Have I not this patience still to exercise, when the Dr. as a further argument for all the contractedness of the Seceders, notwithstanding they have lately renounced the spirit of persecution, quotes those words of our Lord, " Teaching them to observe *all things* I have commanded you †?" Here he supposes the little differences which have exercised the minds of some of the Lord's best disciples, after their most devout attention to the word of God for direction, were among the *all things* commanded by the God of patience, peace, and love; and for such supposed offences, giving them an authority to excommunicate each other. Were not the things there referred to, the essential doctrines of the gospel? and yet this text,

* P. 42. † P. 40

as

as the Dr. has quoted it to serve the purposes of his party, would be equally applicable to very other little sectarian division of the church from the purest ages of the Christian dispensation to the present day. And to conclude the business, we are presented with these words: "If any man consent not to wholesome words, even the words of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, &c." One would have thought, that neither Presbyterians, Episcopalians, nor Independents, would have concluded from hence a scriptural authority to anathematize each other for differences about church government; yet the Dr. brings them forward to speak for him, as though nothing but Antiburgherism were "the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus Christ," and the only "doctrine according to godliness." But had he transcribed the text at large, it would have appeared a strange quotation indeed: *He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness.* No wonder that it is added respecting these, "From such withdraw thyself," But to be told, that a faithful and extensively useful minister of Christ, such as the great and good Mr. Whitefield, was a *brother walking disorderly*, merely because in judgment an Episcopalian, or any thing but an Antiburgher Presbyterian; and to suppose that texts of scripture, describing the worst of professing characters, are to be produced against the real ministers and followers of the Lord Jesus, for no other crime than because they are not agreed as it respects the best mode of discipline in the Christian church, will, I am persuaded, never be admitted by Dr. Jamieson

Jamieson himself, when he takes the honourable standing of a minister of Christ, independent of his connexion with the Antiburgher Seceders. Again, surely he cannot suppose, "keeping the unity of the Spirit," according to his Antiburgher meaning of the text, can be justly produced for such splittings and dividings, as are perfectly distinct from the essentials of Christianity.

Let the Dr. however assert, that no christian union can subsist on terms like these, we happily know and experience the reverse. The lovely uniting spirit which has manifested itself in our late missionary exertions, has produced sufficient evidence how Christians, differently educated and denominated, can, with the most cordial affection, give, at least occasionally, *Christian* and *ministerial* communion to each other. We have seen ministers of the English and Scottish Establishments, Burghers, Baptists, and Independents, (O could we but have added an Antiburgher also!) holding such communion with each other; and what injury could result to the private discipline of their various congregations by such an affectionate intercourse, but that the imaginary fears of the bigot may be alarmed, and their party distinctions be thereby endangered?

In some parts of the Dr.'s pamphlet I am under the painful necessity of *positively* contradicting him. I observed, even meeting for private or family prayer has been judged a sufficient ground for church censure and excommunication; this the Dr. denies; but I have no reason to doubt the veracity of those who have asserted these facts *. And should the whole of the spiritual tyranny,

* An aged Scotch Minister informs me, that when he resided in North Britain about thirty years ago, he remembers it being cur-

 rently

tyranny, with all the consequences which have existed, and even still exist, in the Antiburgher connexion, be exhibited before the Public, I believe no great credit would be thereby gained to the history and mystery of Antiburgherism*.

I must

rently reported without contradiction, that when the above John Erskine lay on his death-bed, he was visited by his Father, who proposed going to prayer with him, but the *conscientious* Son declared, he could not hear the prayer of an excommunicated Minister! The aged Father wept, but the Son died happy, as he was unquestionably a very pious man. The Communicator of this Anecdote knows an instance very similar; and well remembers, that it was deemed a much greater sin to hear a Burgher pray, than to hear him preach, because holding more immediate communion with him.

It is not insinuated, however, that the Antiburgher ministers either wish or believe, that their Burgher brethren will be given up to Satan, to whom they deliver them. Mr. Mair, of Orwell, having on one occasion pronounced this awful sentence, added immediately after, as I am told, that he hoped the Devil would never get a limb of the party excommunicated.

* As the Dr. complains, "that I have given an unfair and exaggerated account of the Antiburghers and their terms of communion," I will present him with a piece of information which I also received from the same person who was educated among them, and was in communion with them, till he left Scotland.

Thirty years ago, he says, he lived in Dunfermline, and attended the ministry of an Antiburgher, whose name was Burt, and who preached about two miles from that place. One summer (during his residence there), when the ordinance of the Lord's Supper was to be administered in the Burgher Congregation, he attended; and heard, as he thinks, two or three good gospel sermons. The circumstance which induced him to go was, that he had an uncle, a reputable and popular minister, among them, who was expected to be there. A few weeks after, when the same ordinance was to be dispensed at the place where he statedly attended, he applied to the minister for a token of admission to the Lord's Table; but he, and some of the elders, having heard of his transgression, would not give him one till he submitted to a severe rebuke, delivered in the usual and solemn manner, "I in the name, and by the authority, of our Lord Jesus Christ, rebuke you," (reader, mark the solemn words with which they presume to sanction this their present spirit; and all this) "for the *great* sin of promiscuous hearing." My friend moreover declares it to be a fact,—and an awful one it is! that

swearing,

I must further contradict the Dr. in his mode of glossing over the conduct of the Seceders towards

swearing, or getting drunk, on occasions, were deemed offences much less censured than hearing a gospel sermon from a minister of any other denomination, and were passed over with a more gentle rebuke.

I have further authority to say, that if these facts be denied, the Communicator of them will give in his name, and vindicate the truth of this his solemn assertion.

My quondam Antiburgher friend farther remarks, that, during his connexion with them, if one of their body had lived even at the next door to a Burgher meeting-house, or to any other place of gospel worship, no excuse arising from illness, or distance, or any other cause, would be deemed a sufficient apology for the crime of "promiscuous hearing;" he must stay at home, and set before his neighbours the bad example of neglecting the public service of God, rather than transgress against these their wretched rules.

Nor have we any reason to believe that their spirit and temper has been in any measure meliorated of late, as they were just as determined against the abovesaid sin; for a sin it must be, unless they sin in making it so, as they have been from the beginning. See their last Synodical Address.

Such an illiberal usurpation over consciences I bless God is utterly unknown among us in the South; and I know I shall be scarcely credited in asserting that such a spirit can possibly exist among any in the North.

Dr. Jameison has lately paid a visit to London: while there, unless he left his Antiburgher conscience on the other side of the Tweed, there was but one place of worship he could possibly attend, unless he was asked to be a public preacher in any place, where afterwards he would not condescend to be a hearer. What an emigrant Antiburgher from the North has to do with his conscience on a sabbath-day, where none of his own fraternity are to be met with, I cannot divine; nor am I acquainted how far, under such circumstances, dispensations and absolutions may be granted. On this subject the Dr. may be better informed than myself, having been an attendant at the worship of that church which traffics largely in these spiritual commodities. I dare not charge the worthy Dr. that he attended at a single meeting, and when he stept aside to hear Mass on a fast day at the chapel in Lincoln's-inn-fields, he attended with a people who at least have one strong feature similar to that of the Dr.'s denomination, acknowledging no church but their own.

good Mr. Whitefield. He would give us to understand, that it was only in their "ecclesiastical capacity they opposed that valuable servant of God for his irregular or unscriptual courses *." He acknowledges, that it is "LIKELY ENOUGH the Solemn League was mentioned to him;" and because he refused to be one of their body, the quarrel commenced. Though dead, he, by his records, shall still speak for himself. I am sorry I cannot give the references as correct as I am sure the quotations are just; but at one time we find him observing, "The Messrs. Erskines's people have kept a fast for me, and give out that all the work now in Scotland is only delusion, and by the agency of the devil." And again, "The Seceders, who, though they had prayed for me at the most extravagant rate, now give out, that *I was agitated by the devil*—taking it for granted, that all converted persons must take the Covenant; and that God had left the Scotch established church long ago; and that he would never work by the hands of a Curate of the church of England—they condemned the whole work as the work of the devil †, and kept a fast throughout all Scotland to humble themselves because the devil was come down in great wrath, and to pray that the Lord would *rebuke the destroyer*, for that was my title; but the Lord rebuked these good men, for they split among themselves, and excommunicated one another ‡."

Could I present the Dr. with another extract, showing the improper spirit of the Seceders on this occasion, as given me when in the North, it would complete the business; but I believe I am accurate in the sentiment which appeared in print,

* P. 39, 40. † Namely, the revival of Religion.
‡ Mr. Whitefield's Letters.

advising

advising Mr. Whitefield "to *wear boots* as a convenient covering for *his cloven foot.*"

If the Dr. will pardon me that I incorrectly delivered the story about the Erskines, I can readily pardon him in contradicting me respecting the conduct of the Seceders towards Mr. Whitefield, it was kindly designed to lessen the odium due to a bad spirit then existing among those good people; and I delivered the story with no other design than to cry down the dying remains of the effects still kept in existence by taking the Covenant. I pardon the Dr. also in his very unjust interpretations of my designs to blacken and malign the Seceders; my design being just the reverse. Every poor Paisley or Glasgow weaver, I am satisfied, will be much more mild and candid in his verdict on this controversy. Lamenting the general depravity of the Established Church, though still blessed with many excellent and useful ministers, I spoke of the utility and necessity of the secession in strong language, and honourably mentioned the Seceders as being a body of people universally acknowledged as the firm friends and supporters of the essential doctrines of the gospel. It was therefore from principles of respect, and not of contempt, that I lamented their contracted notions of church government, as being inconsistent with the spirit of Christianity, detrimental to themselves, and prejudicial to the spread of those noble truths so universally received among them. When the plain simple discipline of the word of God gives way to the party dogmas of different sects, each party has unhappily the appearance of a separate *trading* company setting up for themselves. Hence mere numbers are naturally sought for to strengthen such contending interest,

and

and no small inconsistencies are frequently overlooked to accomplish this end. The Dr. well knows how many an Antiburgher steps aside *to take the Burgess oath*, receives a *gentle* rebuke for his crime, and is still permitted to *live on the spoils of his transgression.*

On taking a further glance at the first part of the Doctor's pamphlet, I cannot dismiss my concluding remarks thereon, without observing in my own defence, that on the Note about *Lifters* and *Antilifters*, I had no more design to "blacken the Seceders with my brush" than I had to blacken myself. When the story was given to me, I did not even know that it was a Seceding story, but supposed it to be a dispute among some other scrupulous disciples, less noticed in the North. It is somewhat strange, however, that the terms *Lifter* and *Antilifter* were unknown to the Dr. till he found them in the Journal.

The Dr. gives many specimens of contradicting, as it appears to me, merely for the sake of contradicting. I observed all the secessions from the church of Scotland, took with them the Presbyterian form of government. No, says the Dr.:— then he mentions Glass, Barclay, and a few others, thinking by such almost solitary instances, to contradict the general assertion *.

Again, I observe, that being excluded from all places of worship at Leith, I was obliged to go out of the common way, and preach in a timber-yard. I am treated here also with the same spirit of *mere contradiction;* for the Dr. tells me, it is no uncommon thing for the Presbyterians to preach out of doors at the *time of the sacrament* †;

* P. 47.

† *i. e.* Once or twice in a twelvemonth.

and

and that the text preached upon (the conversion of Zaccheus) was no uncommon text. I will not dispute it with the Dr. however, that he is gone out of the common way, when, to prove the sincerity of his own complaint, that "the Itinerant work has been too much neglected by them," should I see him booted and spurred, and mounted upon his Rosinante, riding about from town to town, preaching every day through the week, once, twice, and sometimes thrice each day, and continuing these exertions nearly throughout the year. But if there be nothing uncommon in our preaching after all, why this uncommon stir against it?

These labours of mine, however, the Dr. is pleased to style EXTEMPORANEOUS EFFUSIONS *. After such an expression, he shall be at full liberty to possess all his other remarks on the same subject without the least contradiction.

I observe, *strict* Independency is the Antiburgherism of the South. Here again I meet with a flat contradiction; and to cover it a little, the Dr. draws out a long detail of their differences on church government; but the observation was not on the *church government*, but the *church bigotry* of each party; and in this they are likeness itself †.

Before I enter upon the business of Lay Preaching, I must make one observation further on what the Dr. has advanced, especially as it manifests so much of the spirit and style of his pamphlet. I plead much for Christian forbearance, under the idea, that a sound faith in Christ, and a holy correspondent life and conversation, are the essentials of Christianity. The Dr. on the contrary, stands by it, he will have nothing to do with any church but his own, allow-

* P. 78. † P. 46.

ing

ing only a little private intercourse in social or family prayer: this he calls *Christian communion*; yet in public, will have no more to do with us, though acknowledged christians, than if we were heretics, the most impure and profane, because this is holding *ministerial communion*. The distinction is curious. If the one, why not the other?

Now, I say, all this is a scheme of the devil's to *divide* and rule: the Dr. turns right about at me, and says, that "to *unite* and rule is the devil's device;" proves his doctrine, or thinks he proves it, from scripture, because the Jews would not suffer the Samaritans to build with them the walls of Jerusalem. Thus the separated tribe of Antiburghers compare themselves, at least by the pen of their present Apologist, to the Lord's circumcised Israel, who, under that dispensation, were prohibited from every connexion but among their own tribes, in direct opposition to the New Testament dispensation, whereby the middle wall of partition is completely broken down, to prove the Antiburghers do right in building up walls of separation as high as the moon between themselves and all other Christian churches*.

If the Dr. meant this only as an allusion; generally, allusions are taken from striking similarity of events. But his allusions from the Old Testament to the New are *strikingly* the reverse; only as they may relate to the Antiburgher connexion being so near akin to the spirit and temper of that dispensation, and so entirely different to the genius and spirit of the gospel. It is on the same principle the Dr. attacks me because I can hold Christian communion with different churches, notwithstanding some defects. Here he runs me down as holding a doctrine which will direct me to give the right-hand of

* P. 85.

fellowship

fellowship to the avowed enemies of the gospel, and to join communion with Rome itself, with all its preposterous doctrines and abominable idolatries; thereby concluding, that there is no possibility to draw the line between the innocent mistakes, supposing them to be such, of real Christians, belonging to different Protestant communions, and all the abominations exhibited in the antichristian church of Rome itself *.

Controversy is, at all times, a tiresome and perplexing business; but it is rendered doubly so when one's Antagonist appears to have a mere party design. I leave it entirely with our Readers, if, in a variety of instances, the Dr. does not affect to suppose me obscure, and then grossly perverts my meaning. How frequently he observes, "If I understand you so and so, it is to be understood so and so;" then evidently misunderstands me; thus, he stands on a pedestal of his own erecting, strides like a colossus, and proclaims his mighty victory. I shall therefore have nothing more to say on the first pages of the Dr.'s pamphlet, as I wish to meet him on more serious ground,----on that which is called *Lay* and *Itinerant* Preaching.

I find the first of the Dr.'s remarks on this part of his pamphlet are more upon *Itinerant* than *Lay Preaching*. "With respect to the former," says he, "I am far from being an enemy to the thing itself. Too little, I am afraid, has been done in this way by the Protestant churches †." A very gentle tap for shameful negligence! for have they not been *notoriously* deficient? In this respect we *lift up our testimony* against the Antiburghers in particular, though still we will not deny them Christian or ministerial communion whenever they will accept it. The Dr.'s denomination however,

* P. 43. † P. 48.

it seems, have parcelled out the work among themselves into *imaginary districts*; he therefore observes, no minister, "as connected with a particular church, can regularly officiate within the bounds of another charge belonging to it, without leave being asked or given." And it is supposed, if this rule be not observed, "the greatest schism and disorder will speedily be introduced *." But if the Dr. will condescend to pay me an *itinerant* visit at Wotton Underedge (where I write these pages), I will not only thank him heartily for his assistance, but moreover engage, while he continues my guest, he shall never be guilty of the crime of hearing a "superstitious Episcopal †" in return; and I will give him the fullest evidence, that good ministers, of different denominations, can preach every where that men should repent, without wearing fetters forged by such narrow-minded jealousy; and without creating confusion, only by taking a little pains in a friendly consultation, about the times and places of preaching, that we may not divide the congregations, and that we may extend our labours to the utmost of our power.

On the very evening I write this, we meet for mutual exhortation and prayer, held by rotation in the different gospel places of worship in this town. Now, on this occasion, an Independent, a Baptist, and a "superstitious Episcopal," will engage in the same work; we shall want but an Antiburgher minister to complete our joy. Thus what the Dr. says must create "the greatest schism and disorder" in the North, has just the contrary effect in the South; and if he cannot believe it, we know it to be a matter of fact, that brotherly love is not only created, but abun-

* P. 48.

† Not an uncommon expression among the more religious in the North: the Dr. has somewhat like it. Page 19.

dantly

dantly augmented thereby: we have no idea of proving our love by keeping at a ceremonious distance from each other.

But the Dr. quotes scripture to prove his point. And no wonder if we find him in this case, as before, not a little unfortunate in his quotation. "So have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build on another man's foundation *." Did the apostle then suppose he did wrong in preaching where Christ had been preached before? or did he not mean, that he not only did *this*, but *more* than this, in preaching Christ where as yet he was not named?

The Dr. produces another text: "We are forbidden to do evil that good may come †." So then preaching the gospel, contrary to his limited notion of the business, is *doing evil*, and terrible evil indeed, if that text has been aptly quoted; for then it would have been added, *our damnation is just*.

We next observe how the Dr. brings matters round, that he may secure for himself an advantageous attack: from the description he gives of that sort of preaching, this abovesaid itinerant preaching is to be esteemed: "Perhaps he is instrumental of subjecting a great many more to the *curse* of itching ears, in consequence of which they may *turn away from the truth, and be turned unto fables;* it is his *design* to *catch* his hearers by *some new thing*. They are so attracted by the *novelty* of the *manner*, or of the *matter*, especially if *served up* with a *variety of anecdotes* both *moral and entertaining*, or somewhat of the *tragic-comic* kind, such as in their hearing have never enlivened that *dull thing* called a *sermon*, that henceforth they have no *relish* for the tedious uniformity of their regular teachers; they can now be pleased with

* Rom. xv. 20. † Ibid. iii. 8.

nothing that is not a little *eccentric*; they are much more *edified* by this kind of preaching, because the more amused*." In my lifetime I scarcely ever read so much low bitter sarcasm, taking it in all its parts, I had almost said, from the pen of an avowed infidel, as herein appears from the pen of our Antiburgher Dr. †.

The people who hear us, however, are the best judges of the charge. The Dr. himself *can* know nothing but by report, as, from the laws of his sect, he cannot attend upon any preaching but as from the lips of a brother Antiburgher. Though I should scorn to treat this good man with language similar to the above, yet surely to *snarl* and "to *sneer*," can never be improper from the sample now before us. If at least, however, I may be allowed a smile in return for these bitter contemptuous sarcasms, I would observe, that

* P. 49.

† How shall we account for such a reverse of temper, while the Dr. is vindicating the cause of Antiburgherism, compared with the temper manifested in his other works already before the public?

When it is the unhappy lot of a good man to be the apologist for a bad cause, he is frequently lost to self possession. Had the Dr. levelled his attack upon the dead in the same style and language as he has treated the living, an honest faithful Latimer, a pleasant allegorizing Bunyan, a sentimental and ingenious Gurnal, while similar abilities were discoverable in the Erskines themthemselves, the leaders of the Secession would have been charged with *design* and *cheat*, by bringing people under the CURSE *of itching ears, to draw them from the truth and to turn them to fables*, &c. &c. and all this charge, only because good men, of their turn of mind, frequently prove themselves more useful, and are generally better attended, than others not less good and excellent in their way, though of a more severe and phlegmatic cast. Has not a gracious God given to each of his ministers a different turn of mind? and may they not all be equally devoted to him in the sacred work, using their own natural abilities, without insulting each other with language so sarcastic and unjust?

surely

surely the Dr. had slept in an Archbishop's night-cap, and that he was scarce awake when he treated us with all his high church sentiments of minister-making, so contrary, as I still think, to the purity and simplicity of the primitive times. And indeed I should have thought the less of answering, if my view had not been to notice the arguments produced by every other priest-manufacturing denomination, which the Dr. has evidently concentred in his publication; for, by an uncommon method of controversy, he has been pleased to favour me with his remarks on the publications of others. His design may have been to kill many birds with one stone. He should, however, have remembered, that it was quite irrelevant to address to me what he designed as an answer to others.

Half the Dr.'s observations are answered at one stroke. He is again and again supposing that we are pleading for a certain wild enthusiastic itinerancy, which never entered into any one's brains but his own; for, while we look upon it to be the privilege of all to try their gifts before they are educated for, or admitted more immediately into the ministry; yet *where, when, and on what occasion,* has it appeared among us, that the trial of such gifts "should not be under some proper control?" Just as with others, so with the Dr., we hear so much about "the church," a trial before "the church," as commissioned by "the church," that one would suppose *the church* could only be found among *the church* of the Antiburghers, or other priest-manufacturing churches, whose cause the Dr. pleads with such liberality—saving his conscience as an Antiburgher, as after this kind apology he and his brethren must still stand aloof.

Is

Is not any company or communion of good Christians as much *the church* as others? If they find a good Shopman, Farmer, Blacksmith, Tradesman, or what not, of real grace and sound ability, with an aptitude to teach, have not *the church* among them a right to hear him, encourage him, and give him the right-hand of fellowship, without being charged with all the stark staring mad tricks of a set of wild enthusiasts, or as being worthy to be registered where the Dr. has assigned them a place, in the wretched annals of the civil wars during the usurpation of Oliver Cromwell *? Let common sense speak for us, if such, whose aptitude to teach has been evidenced by some previous proof of their ability, are not much more likely to prove able and useful ministers of the gospel than can be produced from all the spiritual *dry nu series* of the day.

The Dr. must therefore first make our cause a bad one, that his attack may be attended with success. At one time he charges us with "encouraging men who have no regular call to the ministry †;" then, "that we encourage men to preach without any call;" that is, we *call* them to preach without a *call*; and again he has it, "preaching without any *regular* call ‡." Now, if the Dr. had been a little candid towards us poor rhapsodical preachers, he would have represented us *fairly*, and would have said, that though this new frightful disorderly sect are free, that all people connected with them should try their gifts among themselves, by private exhortation and prayer, and occasionally encourage them to exercise these gifts more abundantly among their neighbours; yet, on the other hand, they mean not thereby to infringe on the standing ministry

* P. 59. † P. 31. ‡ P. 55.

of

of the word, but suppose such people will, after a proper time allowed to prove their stability and gifts, evidence themselves to be the best characters for that sacred office. They likewise prove they are no enemies to human learning, as they put themselves to a great expence both in England and in Scotland, to give them all the learning time and circumstances will allow. And yet after all this we are told, all are at liberty to preach "*without any call*; that we plead men may go about and preach *without any trial*; that they are *self-sent* *;" that they "will be better ministers *who have no education at all*;" and that "human learning is *treated with contempt* *."

If after all this the Dr. complains of my perversions and misconceptions, I shall be a little surprised. But how he should betray such ignorance and inattention when matters of fact were so plain before him, to me is really astonishing. Surely he must have known that the state of the controversy ought to have been placed in a very different point of view. We appeal to the

* Upon a further perusal of the Dr.'s pamphlet (page 83). he talks of a set of "Lay preachers, who claim a right to preach without any previous education for the ministry; without devoting themselves to this work; without any permission from (a certain thing called) an *ecclesiastical judicatory*; any invitation from a congregation; any approbation, or even trial of their gifts." Here the Dr. seems out of breath, gives a dash—— and goes forward: "Who claim a right to preach wherever they please, if there be no physical obstruction; who assert the perpetuity of this right; who do not subject their gifts to trial by any church; but claim as much authority to explain, exhort, or rebuke, as any can have who are ordained to the ministry of the word." What a string of who's in so short a compass! no less than ten of them expressed orunderstood! That a set of forward, ignorant enthusiasts will take such steps in a land in which liberty of conscience is, and ought to be allowed, is fully admitted; but to charge all this on the persons against whom the Dr. designs his publication, is not only mere declamation without evidence, but diametrically contrary to matters of fact.

religious

religious world in general, if the present method of education does not produce too many ministers who prove themselves ministers heartless and dry in their work; nor is their inactivity at all to be considered as a matter of surprise, when nothing but the mere dint of memory and application among too many of them, is to supply the place of that natural aptitude to teach so necessary for the work. And how can they be discovered who have such gifts naturally belonging to them, unless liberty be granted, under proper limitations, for the exercise of these gifts?

Satisfied therefore of the utility and necessity of such a plan, it is not probable that either the thunders of the established church, or the sneers and jealousies of some good, but narrow-minded people among the Seceders, will constrain us to give up the work we esteem to be of God, unless from the scriptures of truth it is discovered to us that we are acting contrary to his mind and will. This the Dr. attempts to prove, and we are to examine what he calls proof.

He first wishes to be clear of the character of an Evangelist as being no longer existent. To be sure, we hear of the four Evangelists, and we never expect to hear of a fifth: but, if the simple meaning of the word be *teller of glad tidings*, and as the Dr. allows a certain degree of very limited itinerancy, we will not dispute with him about the word while he grants the thing *.

The preaching Deacons or Stewards seem to give the Dr. a considerable degree of trouble, lest they should be found among the number of Lay Preachers. He begins with Philip, and is compelled to a deal of "hard straining" on this occasion. He

* P. 53.

tells

tells us, " It is certain, *that*, *in some cases* AT LEAST, their mission was attended by a miraculous power;" then adds, " this is evident from the account given of Philip." What is evident? " that he wrought miracles." He should have first proved that this power was confined to the primitive *clergy*, and that the *laity* had nothing to do but to be their humble admirers.

He next attempts to make Philip one of the regular ordained primitive *clergy*, because he is called the Evangelist. But if the Dr. cannot prove that the term Evangelist, or teller of glad tidings, belonged exclusively to the *clergy*, his proof, in this instance, will also be as defective as in the former. This I should suppose the Dr. felt, for he says, " Phillip, who was one of the seven, and afterwards *called to be* an Evangelist." Here I should have expected some decided quotation of an appointment to this office; but this CALLED TO BE, *happens* to be wanting in scripture; an unfortunate slip of the Dr.'s pen. The expression only being, " Philip called the Evangelist *." The fact is, this holy and gracious Jerusalem Steward was capable of preaching the word, and we hear he did preach; we find nothing of his designation to that office, but the Dr. supposes it, and seems to prove it by giving a little twist to the expression---" called *to be* an Evangelist †." The Dr. further says, that " at the time that he preached in Samaria, he was released *by divine authority* from serving tables." But as the scriptures are perfectly silent respecting this *release by divine authority*, this assertion can be but *human authority at the best*.

Stephen, the other preaching Steward, also gives him some considerable trouble. Indeed, he vin-

* Acts, xxi. 8. † P. 50. 52.

 dicates

dicates Philip from the crime of Lay Preaching, by the general argument deduced from "*extraordinary and miraculous times*;" and the like excuse has generally been made for the otherwise presumptuous conduct of Stephen. But on this occasion, I think the Dr.'s observations are entirely new; for he says, "he will not contend about the word *preaching*, although it is not used as to Stephen; certain men belonging to a particular synagogue arose *disputing* with him." And farther, "This you may call a sermon if you will that he delivered to the council, but, *strictly speaking*, it was *merely his defence*." I am glad the Dr. *means* not to contend about the word *preaching*, though he seems to contend about it all the time; yet, let people read if it does not sound very much like what others of the apostles preached, and whether the style of his sermon was not much more of the nature of a *charge* than a *defence*. It is a pity the Dr. could not have made Stephen also an Evangelist; or have *lifted him up* a little higher out of the reach of the extemporaneous enthusiasts of the present day. His example, as it now stands, is certainly a dangerous precedent *.

The Dr. brings forward the words Bishop, Overseer, Steward, Messenger, Angel, Ambassador †; producing all these as *sent* and *commissioned* characters, and as having *rule* and *government* over others. Now, in the name of common sense who denies all this? or what has this to do as an argument against the exercise of gifts before such characters be commissioned and sent? Had the Dr. transcribed for us a long list of the kings of Israel and Judah, would it not have been equally to the purpose? only as it may countenance the

* P. 52. † P. 5

mistaken

mistaken notion, that " we allow men to preach without any call, and that the exercise of their gifts is to be under no sort of control.".

The Dr. has a long paragraph in defence of this *priest-making* business, grounded upon that passage, " How shall they preach except they be sent*?" Now the query still is, by whom are these to be sent? The Dr. determines, from some proper, regular manufactories. We on the other side of the question, suppose the word *sent* means *sent of God*; and that it is highly presumptuous and unwise to venture upon educating any for the sacred office before *proof* has been given that they are fit for the office. Let these be found as good raw materials, if I may use the expression, and we quite agree with the Dr. in the propriety of giving such the further benefit of erudition, while we have only to fear and lament lest the present bad method of conducting the

* Some writer in the Missionary Magazine quotes that passage, " Go ye forth into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." He supposes " the obvious general application" to be in favour of such sort of work as we contend for. The Dr. " cannot understand this," (page 53.) He thinks it can admit only a " particular application," as belonging to those to whom it was particularly addressed. Very consistent this with the concluding phrase in the text, " I am with you always, even to the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) This part of the text the Dr. forgot to quote: he forgot also that he had admitted this more extended sense of the text, when he quoted that part of it, " teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Even to the modern times of Antiburgherism, he brings it down to prove they have Christ's authority for all they do; and, if it did for them, why not for us? Yet the Dr. will not allow us the text, though they are to have it for themselves; for he says, if there be any obvious general *command* to preach, why not also of the *command* to baptize? for both are concluded in one command. Why, he should have remembered that we no more concluded that all were *commanded* to preach the word who had not ability, than that all were *commanded* to give money to the poor who had none to give. Thus he frequently perverts our meaning, and plays upon words.

work should cramp the mind, and fatally damp the zeal, and abridge the usefulness of the ministers while under the trammels of their artificial education*.

The Dr. urges the direction of Paul to Timothy †, to commit those things which he had heard of him, to faithful men, who should be *able* to teach others also. He next kindly adds, "They were first to be tried whether they were to teach." This hint, so much in our favour, and so little expected, deserves our peculiar thanks.

The Dr. seems equally a very kind auxiliary in producing that passage, in which Paul enjoined Titus "to ordain Elders in every city." Not to criticise on the word *elder*, as it is generally accepted in the North, I acknowledge what he further says, "that they should be generally known as holding fast the faithful word, as able by sound doctrine to teach, to exhort, and to convince gainsayers." We conclude therefore with him, especially as there were then no Christian seminaries, that Titus took remarkable pains that none but such who had given the fullest evidence of their previous gifts and ability to the work, received a solemn designation to that office. How comfortably to travel with my worthy friend while in such good humour and harmony with each other yet we a little disagree, in the last lines of the paragragh, "Their right to exhort and teach was not founded on their gifts, but on their solemn call by ordination to the exercise." That is, a man's right to the ministry does not exist in being fit for it, but in the condescending grant of his priesthood, to whom he may be *in subjection*.—So it should appear after having turned an ambiguous expression into plain English.

* P. 54. † P. 57.

But,

But, alas! I find our comfortable ocalition with each other is now at an end for he quotes as follows: "No man might take this honour to himself, but he who is called of God, as was Aaron, and ordained of men in things pertaining to God*." Now the Dr. honestly confesses, it is granted, "that the priestly office, in itself, did not prefigure the ministry of the New Testament, but the character of our Lord Jesus Christ, as our true High-priest." Yet this text, acknowledged to be nothing to the purpose, is made to appear something to the purpose after all, by the additional quotation, "I will take them for priests and for Levites †." Then he adds, "In one respect indeed legal priests were forerunners of the gospel ministry; they were the stated teachers of the law to the people." So were Isaiah, Daniel, Jonah, Amos, and all the prophets, and yet none of them are expresly said to be of the tribe of Levi, but Jeremiah and Ezekiel; though some of them, as Isaiah, were of noble blood. Amos was a herdsman, and declares, he was neither a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, till God called him to the work—Did not the Dr. therefore run too fast in calling the legal priests "the forerunners of the gospel ministry?" When a writer runs a great way for a far-fetched argument, his journey seldom proves advantageous to his cause.

This good man, on the same page, next remarks, "Timothy, *as would seem*, was an extraordinary minister." These words, *as would seem*, *extraordinary ministers*, and *extraordinary times*, are very convenient; though there appears, *as would seem*, nothing more extraordinary in Timothy than in others, unless that he was an extraordinary good man. Then the Dr. quotes, "Neg-

* P. 56. † Isa. lxvi. 21.

lect

glect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by, or according to prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery." Now, had the Dr. produced this passage against Quakers, who deny the necessity of a standing ministry, and consequently, the utility of any ordination whatever, it might have been somewhat to the purpose. At present it only stands for a shew of words without argument.

The Dr. however proceeds: "IT IS HIGHLY PROBABLE, the word *gift* here denotes *office*." So that when the apostle further says, "Stir up the *gift* that is in thee," according to the reasoning from *the high probability*, this should have been worded, "Stir up the *office* which is in thee." Now, though I should suppose the immediate design of the Dr. in this remark is, that a man's right to the ministry is not in the gift, but in the office; yet, as I find him more than once mounted on the *high probability*, instead of an argument, we will not suppose him inaccessible notwithstanding. To *stir up an office* is certainly an odd sort of an expression *.

Hitherto

* That the Dr. may prove the word *gift* means "gift of office," as he calls it, he refers to Rom. xii. 6. "Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophesy, let us prophecy according to the proportion of faith."

Now, first, in what point of view a gift of grace is her eo be understood as "a gift of office," I cannot devise; nor yet can I find out why the Dr. has produced this passage to prove that a man has no right to be a preacher from his gifts and graces, but only from his office, while the text plainly decides a person has a right to the office from his gifts and graces. If the Dr. can bring us no better proof that the word χαρισμα means office, I am afraid he will be found as defective in his criticisms as he has been unfortunate in his quotations.

Is it not high time that the Dr. should rub his eyes, and see what he has been at? First, all that are called Elders in the church of Scotland are Laymen; and these he observes, from scripture references, should be men able by sound doctrine

to

Hitherto my antagonist has been upon the offensive; he now appears on the defensive. I find he feels himself considerably grappled from Acts, viii. 1, 4. "At that time there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem, and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles; therefore they that were scattered abroad went every where preaching the word." Now *they* evidently refers to the scattered congregation. And what puzzles yet more is, that the apostles continued still at Jerusalem.

The Dr.'s first business is to limit the word *all*, otherwise: "If all were scattered, the apostles would have remained without any *church* to which they could administer." Now he well knows, the old formal word *church* only means *congregation;* and if the congregation were scattered, there was no congregation left, excepting that the apostles were a little congregation, or, if he likes it, a *church* among themselves. Now, whether some, or all, were scattered, in point of argument, is nothing to the purpose. We find the Dr. again dealing in the dilemma. The first was a very surmountable business; but the second I consider as the most curious I ever met with. First, it is evident that *some* of *the congregation* (for the Dr. shall have the word *all* as he wishes it, in a restricted sense) went every where preaching the word. No, says the Dr. "for if the men preached, it will be naturally supposed, as women fled as well as men," therefore, as they were of the church, they must have preached also;" so that

to convince the gainsayers; men able to teach others also. And from these words he proves, just contrary to the Bible, that none should teach till after they are ordained; while scripture has decided it, that none but such as can teach ought to be ordained.

none

none of them preached. Did the Dr. mean this as wit or argument? What will not even wise men say when they have a point to carry, with so many difficulties to surmount?

The Dr. tries further to bring off this business by observing, " It is *most natural to conclude*" (the same species of argument with the *high probability*), " that they who went every where preaching the word, were *entrusted with official character*, as Philip was." But first, he unfortunately failed in proving that Philip was " entrusted with the official character," as he calls it; nor does he pretend to prove that others were so entrusted; he observes it is a " most natural conclusion." Others have just the same right to observe, that the conclusion was the most far-fetched and *unnatural* that could well have been devised.

He further says, " It is not said of those who were scattered, that they went *teaching*, but that they went *preaching* the word. Now, no other passage can be produced where this phrase is used with respect to any who were *not in office*," though it at once struck me, were they in office " who *preached* another gospel; even perverted the gospel," and who *preached* another Jesus, that Paul had not preached? Yet one quotation further proves the words perfectly synonimous; " they ceased not to teach and *preach* Jesus," (Acts, v. 42.) Yet this is begging the question after all; for the Dr. will have it so, wherever he finds a preaching Steward or Brother, he was a regularly ordained *clergyman* of the primitive church.

The Dr.'s last shift is to apply to Guise and Gill. Now, the propriety of Lay-Preaching is universally known to be the sentiment both of Independents and Baptists, who are independents in church govern-

government. The Dr. adds, that these Commentators "were fully convinced that the *all* here meant were the ordinary preachers *." Who ever doubted it? If they preached, they were preachers, and just what the Dr. would have called *lay*-preachers; had they been called *extraordinary* preachers, it would have served his purpose of confining their example to primitive times.

But I am astonished the Dr. should fly to two such advocates to plead his cause, and that he should be so unacquainted with the method generally adopted among the English Independents in their different places of education, as to suppose that these good men should write so much against their own principles of allowing the liberty to preach among all their gifted brethren†. As soon should I expect to read an elaborate pamphlet written by Dr. Jamieson, even while he continues in his present connexion, shewing that whatever covenants were taken under the Old Testament dispensation, yet that we had not the most distant hint that such covenants were ever adopted under the purer and stronger dispensation of the gospel, and which is in itself a dispensation so obligatory, especially in the ordinance of the communion, as renders every other covenant whatever nothing less than a reflection on the fulness and blessedness of that sacred covenant ordained of God himself. As soon also should I expect to find the same Dr., page after page, exposing the exceeding mischiefs, animosities, and divisions, which have been made by these covenants of mere human authority, whereby Christians have been led to separate, and still continue to be separated from each other, manifesting the most unchristian spirit before the world at large; and then produ-

* P. 57. † P. 60.

cing all those sacred lovely passages, though so sadly distorted in his present publication, directing us " to speak the same things,"---" to be joined in the same spirit,"---forbiding that there should be " any divisions among us who are all one in Christ Jesus," as a proof from the word of God that such a wretched spirit is utterly unbecoming the peaceful gospel of Christ.

But to proceed: The Dr. speaking of the men of Cyprus and Cyrene, as being some of them who were scattered abroad, says, " It is *highly probable*, that one of these was Lucius of Cyrene." And what of that? Nevertheless, as I here find the Dr. again mounted upon his *high probability*, I shall not presume on an attack *.

But the Dr. has still more difficult ground to *get over* on the same page; for he observes, " An argument has been founded on the language of the apostle Peter: ' As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth †." He says, " There is no CERTAIN PROOF that speaking is here meant of *preaching*‡." But, at least from this text, we may stand equal with the Dr. on a *high probability*: and a little higher still, if the fair common sense meaning be allowed to words. For, by the same method of reasoning, there was no " certain proof" that Paul ever preached to the Gentiles, for he only *spake* to them §. So the command given to the apostles is no certain proof that they *preached* in the Temple, as the angel gave them no farther direction than to " go and *speak* to

* P. 60. † 1 Pet. iv. 10, 11. ‡ 1 Thess. ii. 16. § P. 60.

the

the people the words of this life *." I only request every man who has a Concordance, to look over the word *speak*, and he will find it a very common general word for *preaching*; and I am satisfied the Dr. would not have made use of such a criticism if he had been contending upon surer ground, and for a better cause.

The Dr.'s next difficulty respects the preaching of Apollos before a regular call received. To plain reason, the text presents us with no difficulty: "A certain Jew, named Apollos, born at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the scriptures, came to Ephesus. This man was instructed in the ways of the Lord, and being fervent in spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John †." Now, knowing no more than this, he certainly did not preach by apostolic commission. Perhaps it might have helped the cause a little, had it been *supposed* he was *ordained* by John the Baptist. I am sure he might quite as well have *supposed* this, as that he was shut up in the synagogue exclusively at Ephesus, till after his *supposed* regular admission into the Christian ministry, and his *supposed* advancement to the office of Evangelist by the expression *watering* the churches.

But to put a face upon this business, we are told, that "These synagogues had peculiar customs, which form no pattern for the Christian church." I did not know that there was much more analogy between a Jewish synagogue and a Christian society, than there is between a syllogism and a rose. All that I can find is, that they were built merely as places for public instruc-

* Acts, v. 20. † Ib. 18. 24. 28.

tion; and any one who had the word of instruction was at liberty to speak. This appears evidently as it respects our Lord and his disciples, and in many places throughout the Acts.

Now that this liberty was allowed among the Jews is undeniable. What end therefore could be answered in confining Apollos to the synagogue at Ephesus, I cannot devise *. If it was wrong for him to preach in one place, it was wrong for him to preach in another; and if Apollos preached in the Ephesian synagogue, I will engage for it others more deeply instructed in Christianity were found to preach there also. If therefore the Dr. could but prove that what was evidently allowed to the Jews, was at the same time, or a little afterwards, prohibited among Christians, and bring chapter and verse to substantiate that point, he would have produced a better argument than if he had collected a thousand suppositions.

For, doubtless, according to the Dr.'s ideas, had Apollos really offended, we should have found some proper words of castigation or direction by the synod that then was, against *a disorderly brother*. But notwithstanding, this Lay-Preaching Apollos, though he preached before holy orders, and in the same places where the Apostles themselves generally preached, viz. in the synagogues, instead of a rebuke from the very face of the scriptures, received just the reverse; for we next find, that "when Aquilla and Priscilla had heard of him, they took him unto them, and expounded unto him the way of God more perfectly; and when he was *disposed* to pass into Achaia, the brethren wrote, exhorting the disciples to receive him; who, when he was come, helped them much through grace." Now, it most evidently appears, that the

* P. 61.

disciples.

disciples found this eloquent, zealous, half-converted Christian preaching with great fervour and diligence, without their knowledge or immediate consent, simply following the emotions of his own pure and upright mind.

But the word "*so disposed,*" is another troublesome passage in the text. This suits ill with the idea now in vogue respecting imaginary districts, arising from the narrow contracted spirit of modern times, when contrasted with those happier seasons in primitive days, in which they were enabled, with the greatest justice and freedom to say, that it was "in simplicity and godly sincerity, and not with fleshly wisdom, they had their conversation in the world." When such divisions appeared in those days, the question was asked, Are ye not carnal [*i. e.* fleshly], and walk as men?

To follow the Dr. throughout all the long string of the rest of his suppositions and conjectures *, and so contrary to the plain obvious sense of the passage itself, especially when he presents us with no other argument than "*the highly and most probable,*" can be of no service to the controversy, as the major part of them are nothing to the point, but only as they serve to set us off as countenancing preachers, "without any regular call," as being "self-sent missionaries;" and who pretend to preach "without any other attestation than the good opinion we have of our own gifts," &c. If *straining hard* had not put the Dr. in an ill humour in his concluding remarks on this Lay-Preaching Apollos, he would not have written in a style so incautious and severe: for the above are his expressions on this very subject.

Dr. Jamieson has his fears lest that passage also should sound a little too favourable to Lay-Preach-

* P. 50. to 69.

ing

ing: Many of the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear *."

Here he gravely observes, every unprejudiced reader would understand his language as implying that the persons referred to had formerly been preachers. This is fully admitted. Thus far I am one of his unprejudiced readers—but still they were *preaching brethren.* The Dr. acknowledges that " the expression *brethren* must, in *many places* (he might have said in *most places*), be understood of *Christians in general.*" But then again, " the term *brethren* must, in a *variety of passages*, be understood as limited to ministers †." Certainly, where one minister speaks of another minister, and calls him brother, it must be limited to that minister to whom it was spoken. But by what authority does my antagonist, in the text before us, thus limit the expression? Such is the forced and unnatural limitation of words to which his cause impels him to resort.

The Dr. has next to get clear of that expression, " Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is," but *exhorting one another.* Here our author shelters himself under the observations of the learned ‡: " It has been argued by some learned interpreters, that the term rendered *assembling together*, does not properly refer to assembling in public, but to private intercourse." But the Dr. and his learned friends might have remembered, excepting when the apostles occasionally preached to the multitude, the primitive disciples had all their churches or congregations in private houses: driven about by the rage of persecution, they frequently " had no certain dwelling-places." At one time, we find them hid in

* Heb. x. 25. † P. 64. ‡ Ibid.

an

an upper room for fear of the Jews; and not much better off at another time for fear of the Gentiles; St. Paul's church at Rome itself being nothing but his own hired house. But then what becomes of the argument against Lay Preaching, if these were churches, and the good people exhorted one another?

He then therefore forsakes the ground of the learned, supposing it not very tenable, grants them to be churches, but by no means admits they "exhorted one another." Then, if they had no regular ordained minister among them, he can have no doubt but it must have been a silent meeting, as among Quakers. He gives us therefore to understand, it means, "They provoked one another." To what? "Why, not to forsake the assembling ourselves together, as the manner of some is." What a clever invention! the text is just turned bottom uppermost. We vulgar readers concluded the passage meant, that they assembled themselves together to exhort one another. The Dr. gives us to understand, that it meant to exhort one another to assemble themselves together. We conceived the passage answered as a fair sailing-boat to bring us safely through the difficulties of Lay-Preaching, while, all at once, the Dr. comes and tilts us over in the abyss of his profound invention!

The Dr. has some further arguments to answer as being favourable to Lay-Preaching; he "thinks it rather strange to ask who sent Luther and Calvin, and other great men, to preach the gospel." He supposes the question sufficiently answered by admitting, that though their ordination was from Rome, and consequently thoroughly corrupt, it was still valid. So that a Popish ordination to say mass, and preach merit, is to

stand

Protestant ordination, to administer the sacraments and preach the gospel. But then she annihilated her ordination by her excommunication. To this it is answered: "She was right in the essential parts of her ordination, but altogether wrong in her excommunication." Though I cannot see why she was not as wrong in the one as in the other; for most churches claim the power to take away where they have the power to give*.

Now I confess I should tremble for the cause of Lay-Preaching, if we had no better argument to support it than the above. It is not so very *strange*, however, to ask the question, as it is to find so many Protestant churches making so much of a Popish ordination, for the sake of a chimerical apostolic succession; nor near so strange as to find, that an Antiburgher minister can plead the cause of ordination as derived from "this Mother of Harlots or Abominations: supposing that a successional title to the ministry of the word could flow to them from a channel so perfectly corrupt, while they are so pure, that they can, with confidence, *lift up a testimony* against every Protestant church on earth beside their own.

Dr. Jamieson next produces a scruple of conscience, as it related to John Knox, respecting the ministry, supposing that it would corroborate his argument as above. Now, one would have concluded this scruple of conscience would decidedly have determined, that the valuable Reformer would not have opened his mouth till after a regular and formal ordination. Herein I just transcribe the Dr. as I find him†: "That eminent servant of God, John Knox at first "utter-

* The Antiburghers claim the same power. † Page 87.

ly

ly refused' to listen to the earnest entreaties of John Roughe, preacher, who wished him to enter on public work because he was himself oppressed by the multitude of labours.' He alleged, "That he wald not rin quhair God had not call-it him." And it was only after he had been publicly charged by the said Mr. Roughe in the name of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ, and of the whole congregation, to take on him the office and charge of preaching, that he complied, as himself declares, 'with greif and trobill of hairt'." Now for what reason this quotation was produced I really cannot discover. Did the Dr. mean to assert, that John Knox being publicly charged by Mr. Roughe in the name of God and of his Son Jesus Christ, and of the whole congregation, was a sufficient call to the ministry? or did some naughty designing person slip this into the Dr.'s pamphlet, to prove, that the worthy Reformer, dissatisfied with a Papal commission, would not stir till the mere call or charge of Mr. Roughe and the people, without any further ordination, set him forward in the blessed work of reformation * ?

The Dr. next asks the question, "What are private Christians to do, who are animated by ardent love to perishing souls, when they are neglected by others who are in office †?" The answer is so hard and cruel as really fills me with surprise:---nothing is to be done for them, though for lack of knowledge they perish by thousands. No hand is to snatch these brands from the burning, unless in their way authorized for the work. Still the Dr. vouchsafes a list of things that a layman *may* lawfully do without the leave of his priests. "They may," says he, "plead with their *mother*." But I fear, if precious souls are to be left to the success of such pleadings with these different old *mothers*, they must be left in

* P. 67. † Ibid.

a terrible plight in the interval. But if she resists all their pleadings they *may* "apply to some religious society in which the gospel is preached." I wish some obedient son of an Antiburgher congregation would try the experiment, and invite any minister of another denomination to preach the word of life to poor perishing souls, and we should soon see the result. Again, "they *may* contribute their substance for sending the gospel in *a regular way* *"----that is, if they have any substance to contribute. A wonderfully gracious permission! And further, they *may*, as they have opportunity, "*privately exhort them as to the ministers they should go to hear*," taking care not to infringe upon the *holy craft*, by giving a little advice to perishing souls, though perhaps twenty times better and fitter men for it than the priests who forbid them. And lastly, if they *may* not preach, "they *may* pray the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth labourers into his harvest." And yet, if the Lord answers the prayer, and gives zeal and ability for the glorious work, instead of such being accepted and ordained to the office, it must be left to these different priesthoods, and these old mothers, how far they *may* or *may not* exert themselves for the salvation of immortal souls.

Is then no humane man, though skilled in medicine, at liberty to heal his dying neighbours, because he does not act under a regular diploma? May not one give a little good advice to such as need it, though not regularly bred to the profession of the law?

In the next page my Remarker further observes: "Zeal for the salvation of others, is not

* That can be in no way but the Antiburgher way, they having lifted up their testimony against all Christian churches for their irregular ways.

a suffi-

a sufficient call to the work of the ministry"—and no one ever thought it was, without suitable gifts and graces; and then he quotes our Lord's prohibitory words to his apostles, under the dispensation of that day, not to go into the way of the Gentiles, nor to enter into any of the cities of the Samaritans. Supposing it might have *then* been argued, "are not the souls of Gentiles and Samaritans as precious as those of the Jews*?" Thus he sets us arguing against the express command of our Lord in that day, to shew that we are not in our day to obey another express command, "to preach the gospel to every creature, even to the end of the world."

It may now be necessary further to remark, that the Dr.'s *confutation* of the scriptures in favour of *Lay-Preaching*, to continue the old Popish nick-name, is very incomplete, several passages on this subject having been omitted.

First, He should have obviated that passage in Col. iii. 16. which looks so favourably towards our cause: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto the Lord." Here the Dr. might be quick upon us, by observing, the teaching and admonishing is only in *psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs;* and if these were then performed as they now are in the North, with their doggrel version of David's Psalms, and their method of singing were the same, they must have been very edifying meetings indeed. But lest I should be taken for a barbarian, I will do as the Dr. has done, put myself under the protection of the learned. The annotations extracted from the Synopsis of the learned Poole, thus give the interpretation of the text: "If

* P. 68.

all the saints at Colosse *were concerned in this exhortation*, the Papists oppose the spirit of God in excluding (those *they call*) *the laity* * from familiarity with the scriptures in their mother-tongue; being that *all Christians* are here indispensably obliged to instruct and warn themselves according to the original word, as well as each other mutually. *Then* the use of the word, and the manner of expressing their thankfulness to God among themselves, is in singing his praises in psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs." So that it was the opinion of Poole, that they did not only teach and exhort by singing, which would have been an odd way of accomplishing the business; but that teaching and exhorting was one part of the work, and singing was another. Now, if teaching and exhorting are to be considered as being somewhat different from preaching, I would have the Dr. look at his Concordance; and in many places he will find the expression to mean precisely the same thing.

Leaving him, however, to settle this matter with Mr. Poole, I proceed to 1 Cor. xii. 7. It is there said, "the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal." Now, if the Dr. pleases, we will limit the words *every man*, to every man who had ability. This, however, will hardly bring off the business: we will therefore further admit, that these were extraordinary times, and extraordinary gifts were spoken of; but then if this privilege was granted to all among the Jews before the extraordinary times commenced, and the same conduct precisely followed after their commencement, the analogous reasoning then is not only strong, that it was still lawful, but also sanctioned by the Holy Ghost, who then

* This expression was as much detested by the Presbyterian a century ago, as the modern ones admire it.

more

more immediately presided over the congregations of the primitive saints.

Let this passage be considered in its connexion a little farther, and compared with chapter xiv. where we find a plain account of the mode of worship at these primitive meetings, when there was more of the spirit, and less of the form, than in later ages. Still we grant the times were extraordinary; but if nothing is to be done like the primitive church, because they were extraordinary times, then we must neither administer the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, nor Baptism, for the same reason. But upon the face of the chapter what do we find? That public praying, prophesying, singing of psalms, speaking with tongues, were open to all. But we may be told, nothing can be advanced for ordinary *Lay-Preaching* from this extraordinary *prophesying*. On this word the argument may seem to hinge. Matthew Poole, no Lay-Preacher, nor enemy to human learning, decidedly determines, "that prophesying was given but to few under the New Testament dispensation;" and "that it was more probable that he speaketh of an ability to open the scriptures, either by immediate revelation, or by ordinary meditation." And in this sense they might *all* prophesy *one by one!* A terrible expression, for its unlimited extent. in the judgment of all priest-making denominations!

But to confirm the sentiments of Poole, and many others throughout the whole of the chapter, there appears not the most distant hint about foretelling future events; it is merely on the subject of "edifying one another," see verses 4.; 19. 24, 25. 29.: in short the whole runs upon the principle, that to prophesy was the most preferable, because it was the mode of general edification

fication. Nor yet did the times appear so very extraordinary after all, but that a consderable degree of disorder was found among them which needed some correction. As a further proof of this we read verse 29: "Let the prophets speak, two or three, and let others judge." This prophesying, therefore, could not have been under such an immediate inspiration as we find in other parts of Scripture, for then *judging* would have been quite out of the question. Nor yet could the Apostle have said to them, v. 20. "Be not children in understanding," if "the word of wisdom" had always been upon them as on the day of Pentecost. It therefore appears, that a degree of human weakness had already mixed itself in their solemn assemblies: and if we find the same human weakness attending in our days also, we are not authorized thereby to relinquish the divine precedent set before us in the word of God, and attempt to mend the matter, by *making up* ministers, whom God never designed for the office, by the cramped rules and inventions of men.

I shall only present the Dr. with two other texts, peculiarly worthy the consideration of a *Presbyterian* divine. I believe we are both nearlly agreed in our ideas of the character and office of the *Elder*. Now, many of these were to be "ordained," or, according to its more simple meaning, "appointed," in every city. Every Presbyterian congregation, therefore, has many elders appointed over the same church: now, these elders, as was originally appointed, were not only to be "apt to teach," but also "able, by sound doctrine or teaching, διδασκαλία, both to exhort and convince gainsayers," Tit. 1. 9.;" and it seems they had enough to do in this work; for there were

were many of this sort, "especially they of the circumcision." Dr. Jamieson knows it is no uncommon thing for such as are of the "stricter sects" to be the most contentious. Now, I ask him, is there no difference between *his* office, and character, and that of his elders? If so, how would he like such a set of elders in his church? or, what sort of discipline and correction would they soon meet with, were they such as simply followed the direction thus given them in the word of God? Or will he say, "teaching, exhorting, and convincing gainsayers," is not public preaching? Or, would he and his brethren renounce their own church government, and side with the Independents? some of whom suppose these were all separate pastors of little independent churches in the same city, overlooking the difficulty of Titus being directed to appoint them! I fairly lay this question before every Presbyterian in Scotland, whether these elders were not evidently designed as coadjutors in the office of the ministry; and whether they must not have been a *little* public in their work, when gainsayers were to be exhorted and convinced by their instrumentality; and may it not be supposed, that all this might be done without infringing on the standing ministry of the word?

That I may farther keep in the good graces of my Presbyterian brethren, the *platform* of whose church government, in many respects, I admire, I observe, that when Paul writes to the Thessalonians, he writes only to *the church*, not *the churches*. Now, the members of this one church, or congregation, he thus exhorts: "We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish

nish you, and esteem them very highly in love for their works sake*."

The Independents, who very justly and universally admit the propriety of Lay-Preaching, would probably give us this solution of the difficulty: they would call them "the gifted brethren belonging to the church," as they generally express themselves; but this would not do for the Dr. By his opposition to Lay-Preaching he puts himself into difficulties, which, from the nature of his own church government, might have been easily explained; for, admitting the natural solution, that these labourers and admonishers were some of the elders, or bishops, or overseers, that were to be ordained or appointed in every city, we find nothing here but what is perfectly consistent with their characters, as before mentioned, namely, that they were they who were "able by sound doctrine to convince and exhort gainsayers." Admitting, therefore, that the elders or overseers who were appointed had a measure of gifts, so as to be qualified, in a subordinate degree, to be the helpers in the ministry of the word, agreeable to the 14th chap. of the 1st Epistle to Corinthians, the ground is natural, and every term explains itself; but if this ground does not please my opponent, he is at liberty to seek for another standing from whence he may better defend his cause†.

I would lastly observe on this part of the subject, that it is pretty evident a controversailist has the wrong side of the question when he has principally to avoid or evade the arguments of his opponent; or, in other words, when he has to *get*

* 1 Thes. v. 12.

† The Dr. might further have been reminded, that in v. 11. they were to "edify one another," and ver. 14, they were to "warn the unruly, and comfort the feeble-minded;" it should appear, therefore, that their mouths were not so closely locked up as he would give us to understand.

over

over a number of difficult passages. Through several long pages I find the Dr. at this work: and many of these difficult passages he discovers in the Acts of the Apostles.

Now, Dr. Paley, as was before noticed in a former publication, observes from that book, and other collateral passages of Scripture, a striking similarity between the primitive Christians, and the modern Methodists and Moravians; and we have reason to thank him for the comparison, though we lament being so much beneath the mark. Dr. Jamieson, however, cannot discover the smallest resemblance whatever: but that he has found himself a little pinched, is evident enough. The business could not be trusted to a common sense interpretation, but to *high probabilities* and far-fetched deductions. To illustrate this remark, we will see if we cannot conceive a 29th chapter of Acts more consistent with the presupposed ideas of the Dr. respecting the restrictions and regulations of the gospel ministry in the primitive church.

Acts xxix.

Ver. 1. Then Paul and Silas hearing that certain disciples in the regions of Phrygia and Pamphilia did preach unto the multitude, and in the synagogues of the Jews,

2. They sent unto them Mark, and certain other brethren, from Antioch, to know concerning them, whether they were ordained by Titus, or any of the Apostles or Evangelists.

Now here we *might have supposed* that this was no argument against Lay-Preaching, as they were only *sent to inquire*, and that it was *highly probable they might have been Lay-Preachers before*, and that Titus *might afterwards have ordained them*; then the Dr. in return would have cut us

short in his answer, by observing, that though we *strained hard*, yet the plain meaning of the text inferred a censure on those who preached without orders, and that, consequently, all the *suppositions*, and *high probabilities*, were nothing to the purpose.

We will now suppose the sense of the chapter to be continued till

Ver. 14. After certain days the disciples which were at Antioch sent certain of their brethren, fit and chosen men, unto James and John, and unto the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem, that they might be ordained to preach unto the Gentiles that were in the regions of Phrygia and Pisidia.

Here again we *might* have supposed, that it is *highly probable* they *might* have gone out as Lay-Preachers before they had been sent out as ordained ministers; and that the Apostles *might* have known they were good preachers, and therefore *might* have ordained them. Here, however, the Dr. would still have held us fast in hand, smiled at our *suppositions*, and brought us down from our *high probabilities* by one fair observation. Nothing is mentioned about their preaching before their ordination, but that *they were ordained to preach*. Doubtless, this would have been a little contradictory to what we hear of preaching Stewards, or Deacons, and Brethren; yet, as the Dr. has either turned these into Evangelists or extraordinary characters, and has put all the preaching brethren into holy orders, we must think no more about them.

We will now proceed upon the above conceived chapter, and suppose ourselves at the two following verses.

Ver.

Ver. 20. Then Peter, James, and John, did ordain that Mark, and certain of the brethren, should go from Jerusalem to Philippi with the decrees of the apostles and elders, that certain of the Church who had "walked disorderly" should be put from among them,

21. Because that they had preached and taught among the Heathen in the name of the Lord Jesus, not being appointed thereunto by the apostles and elders which were at Jerusalem, whereby many believed through grace.

Now, had we met with such a stubborn text, what could we have done with it? Why, we must have observed, as once an honest woman did to me, respecting a part of the conduct of the Antiburghers, "Nae au guid that guid men do." And there we might have shewn, that Peter denied his Master, and afterwards dissembled; and that James and John called down fire from heaven; and that now they, like some other people, had got into a bad tyrannic spirit over their brethren; or perhaps we might have shifted the ground, after the example of the Dr. in many instances, and observed, that these were *primitive and extraordinary times*, and what was a rule for them was to be no rule for us; or again, we *might* have supposed, as good was done by it, that was sufficient, for many believed through grace. We should judge, however, at all events, that something must be done with the text, if it were to be turned bottom uppermost, as the Dr. served Heb. x. 25. as it most palpably contradicts Acts viii. 1, 4. which so plainly declares, that not the Apostles, but the Brethren, preached among the people when scattered by persecution; as well as many other passages. But to finish

our chapter from the 29th to the 33d verses, we will suppose a concluding passage.

Ver. 30. In the days of unleavened bread, when the apostles and elders assembled at Jerusalem, they all with one consent decreed, that certain schools of the prophets should be appointed in Jerusalem and Antioch, according to the commandment that went before in the days of Samuel and the prophets;

31. And that James and other of the disciples from among the elders of the people, chosen men, and full of the Holy Ghost, should be separated to this office and administration: that many of the brethren might be instructed in the way of the Lord, to preach the word of life unto the people.

32. Then the apostles and elders also decreed, that it might not be lawful for any of the brethren "in subjection unto them," to teach and to preach unto the people, unless ordained thereunto by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.

33. Unto which when the apostles and elders had consented, they did also decree, that if any brother should transgress the commandments of the church, he might be delivered unto Satan, to be punished in the flesh, that they might be saved in the day of the Lord.

(Here ends the 29th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles.)

Now what a most delightful subject would this have produced as a text for a sermon before the Antiburgher synod in May last 1799, when they appeared the humble echo of the grand fulminating explosion from that *most sacred body*, the General

neral Assembly, and let the public judge what a terrible warfare we have been called to sustain between two fires under such a discharge of ecclesiastical artillery levelled against Lay-Preaching, and Sunday schools, whether supported by Independent, Episcopal, or Nondescript.

According to the account of our *political* high church antagonists, we deserve to be hanged—we are a set of artful and designing rebels. According to the decree of our *spiritual* high church opponents, we are in our religious sentiments complete barbarians, being the "enemies to learning, and the standing ministry of the word." We have no discernment whether an ingenious tinker, like John Bunyan, with grace in his heart, or a thick-headed graduate, will make the best minister. We are—shall I repeat all the Dr. has said against us?—No: he is a good man, though his language has been frequently sarcastic, and in many instances his misrepresentations very cruel and unjust. Let the controversy be left with the public, before whose bar we have now committed our cause.

A few of the Dr.'s remarks, found on the concluding pages of his pamphlet, must not be omitted. He next brings forward an idea of the manifest disorders that must attend all this Lay-Preaching; and in order to deter us from it, brings forth the frightful pictures exhibited in Oliver Cromwell's days *. But sure we may select good and gifted men wherever, in providence, we can find them; encourage them to try their abilities, and afterwards ordain them, without being subjected to those formidable consequences that have found their existence in the Dr.'s terrified imagination. Even in the apostles' days, bad men were stirred up to preach. Neither was this

* P. 68.

any

any fault of theirs; nor was it in their power to prevent it.

The Dr. supposes that I meet these objections, because I acknowledge this liberty was liable to abuse; though my design was to shew how much *less* liable it is to abuse, than other methods of raising up men to the ministry. He however settles the business, by telling us, "the very use of it is abuse *; and by supposing that we are acting counter to the mind of Christ, who has instituted a regular ministry." We always thought he had; and the Dr. acts contrary to all the rules of controversy, again and again, by charging upon us preposterous suppositions, which we seriously disown †.

Some-

* P. 69.

† The Dr. on the same page quotes Eph. iv. 11. "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors, and some teachers," with this observation: "It merits particular attention, and especially *from all who profess to be the friends of Christ*, that he instituted *a regular ministry*." Now, though this passage rather proves the reverse of the Dr.'s design, as the officers should be first sent of God before they were to be ordained of man, yet it answered the end; first, that the *professed friends of Christ* should be warned against a set of wild enthusiasts, who were *enemies to a regular ministry*. He then favours us with a fuller application of that additional passage, "That we henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine and *cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive*." What comfortable reading all this must have been to another set of the Dr.'s admirers, the friends of the General Assembly, corroborating their judgment against us, as it respects our *ignorance, design* and *art!*

I know not that I have now omitted a single argument of the Dr.'s against Lay-Preaching, excepting a short remark he makes on Paul's ordination, p. 80, which happens to stand at the wrong side of the question. It was a considerable while *after* he had been a preacher, before he and Barnabas were separated to a peculiar district, Acts xiii. 3. The different church economies, who are for "the regular call," are requested to inform us how far the Holy Ghost, in these times, has not given us an ex-

ample

Sometimes the Dr.'s misconceptions involve him in inconsistencies. While he admits *, that I strongly plead for the existence of universities and academies, only lamenting their perversion from the purity and simplicity of the gospel; yet on the very next page, on an observation of mine, that "they who take up religion as a matter of choice, are much more likely to be sincere, than others who take it up as a matter of mere profession;" even on this plain sentence the Dr. affects to find a difficulty: "As far as I can apprehend the force of this argument," he says, "it implies, that those only can be viewed as taking up religion as a matter of choice who are served by Lay-Preachers; *or* by those *at least* who have no regular education." So that I am *for* human learning, and *against* it. Did I advance a syllable impeaching the integrity of such as live by the gospel they preach? I only hinted a "liability of abuse;" nor did I mean the most distant reflection on such, by speaking honourably of those characters, whose private fortune enabled them to preach Jesus freely to the multitude.

On the same subject the Dr. meets me with a similar remark. Speaking of preachers, he observes, "the church is not less exposed to danger from other sinister motives; they may be *heady, desirous of the admiration of the multitude*, and *eager to form a party*, while even their *apparent* disinterestedness may prove the *greater snare*." Such are the Dr.'s *candid insinuations*, and lucu-

ample, that he will choose by whom the word of life is to be preached, or, in what part of the Sacred Code his holy operations were to be regulated according to the restricted rules of the present day.

* P. 71.

rations

brations on the labours of the rich. I well know, and highly honour, one Antiburgher minister, a gentleman of fortune, whose charitable conduct and unquestionable disinterestedness render him highly honourable. Had I sported with his character, and insulted him with the like insinuations, because I was not pleased with his denomination, the public might have said I had dipt my pen in gall indeed.

I wish to shorten my remarks on the Dr.'s pamphlet, that I may present before the reader some further suggestions which have occurred to my mind, while I have been engaged in this controversy.

Dr. Jamieson attempts to clear the Church of Scotland from the charge of countenancing Lay-Preaching, in the admission of their young academics, under the term of Licentiates, to preach in their church, before they are ordained. He then produces a string of formalities respecting their learning, admission by presbyteries, throughout near three long pages, to prove—What? Why, what care the Church of Scotland takes to turn out their unordained Licentiates in proper ecclesiastical order. The slovenly, careless methods adopted in their admissions, being after all not less known to the Dr. than ourselves; still are they not admitted to preach before their ordination? What sort of a preacher then is the man before he is ordained? Why, he is a *Lay-Preacher;* and the Dr. may rest assured, that many against whom he levels his artillery, take quite as much pains; and under principles much more reasonable and consistent in the admission of Lay-Preaching among those connected with them, as is adopted by many of their most formidable opponents.

I have

I have before observed, that when the Dr. seems to find it difficult to understand me, he is at no difficulty to *misunderstand* me. This was an observation of a worthy minister, to me, of his own denomination. He supposes that I conclude all revivals of religion are to be from Lay-Preaching; "and that we wish to reform the church by Lay-Preaching," because I plead their assistance in connexion with the ministers already set apart for the work. And further, because I say there are revivals and declinings in different churches, therefore I am for "*revolutions in religion.*"* These very disingenuous interpretations may please the bigot of the Dr.'s party, but will do no essential service to his cause.

I wish not to tire the attention of my readers, by enlarging these remarks. But we next find ourselves peculiarly implicated, detected, and exposed, in language not very dissimilar to the late pastoral admonition in which we receive a pretty severe castigation, as being "artful and designing men:" for he observes, "When Lay-Preaching commenced among us," as if it was nothing else but Lay-Preaching, "it was currently declared, that no new party was to be set up;" but, says he, "*the veil was too thin* †;" or, in other words, we were acting *under a mask*; and the *mask* is fallen off. Now, I verily believe, when that most worthy, invaluable servant of God, Mr. James Haldane, who seems here to be implicated, began to preach the gospel throughout Scotland, he then no more thought of filling his present pastoral office in Edinburgh, than I have of being promoted to the office of an Elder in the Dr.'s congregation. Yet "this our Union Church is

* P. 84. † P. 87.

founded on the introduction of disunion into other churches*." What was that to Dr. Jamieson? He and his brethren have "lifted up their testimony" of disunion also against every church but their own. May not we do the same? I beg, however, on this occasion, to propose some questions. Did ever the members of the Union Church propose to their members, restricted anathematizing terms of communion; that they must break off all connexion with every other Christian society but their own? Are not all left at full liberty to hold communion with them occasionally; and still continue in communion with the congregations to whom they more immediately belong, demanding only a godly life, and an experimental knowledge of the gospel? What infringement make we then on other churches by rules like these? But this remark is abundantly the more inconsistent, as it respects disunion from this disunited Antiburgher minister; as, I dare say, were he obliged to enlarge his own place of worship twenty times till it was as spacious as Solomon's temple, he would ask them "no questions for conscience sake," but take all in, and leave every other church completely depopulated, while he and his denomination would be left in full triumph in their success gained. These they would afterwards shut up in their places of close *spiritual confinement*, giving them to know, that though there was no crime in "promiscuous hearing," while they attended on an Antiburgher, yet now, they having commenced Antiburghers also, even the promiscuous hearing of the very persons from whom they have revolted, is to be punished with the CURSE of excommunication itself.

* P. 87.

After

After all this, it is curious to suppose the Dr. can have any right to ask, "Have not independent churches been erected, under the wing of this society, in different places?" Yes, verily, they are independent of complex and corrupt Presbyterianism; of lordly and tyrannic Episcopacy; and of narrow rigid Independency; and have no more to do with the contracted government of Independency, properly so called, than the Dr.'s church has to do with the spirit of universal unity and love. Nor could he be ignorant, that the strict Independents in Scotland and England as much disapprove our plan, and disown any connexion with us, as we do the contracted behaviour of a rigid Seceder. But let the Dr. or any other godly minister, of any denomination, come and try us; if our pulpits be not universally open to them; if we shall not be happy to communicate with them, and receive the communion from them.

I could not, myself, be permitted to leave the North, on my last tour, unless I came, almost on purpose, to dispense the communion in the Circus. Was there a whisper of disapprobation against such a freedom of Christian fellowship with the "superstitious Episcopal?" Just the reverse! and yet we are Independents. Now, I will give the Dr., and others, this fair promise: when it can be proved, that the good people I have been called to serve, shut up their communion, and commence *a mere sect;* when they disunite from any ministers of the gospel, whose lives are consistent with the truths they preach, who are willing to serve them, I will confess they have deceived me; and then I shall as much lift up my poor testimony against them, as I now do in publishing this against the bigotry and party zeal of the Antiburghers.

It is notable, however, that this remark about establishing Independent chapels, should be addressed to me, after the free observations made in my last publication, as it respected Independent government, unless indeed he chose to represent me as writing against myself *.

The Dr. on the same page, gives us to understand, there are a sufficient number of places of gospel worship already, if people would but fill them, and pews are open to receive them †. If then the places of worship already built will not hold one quarter of the people; and these they will not attend, let him rejoice, with us, there is one place they will attend. Thus we have, from the Dr., an excellent argument, how useful the present plan is likely to prove, to increase the number of worshippers in the North. Notwithstanding his caricatured representation of our preaching and conduct, I believe he will, in his milder moments, allow that some *little* good may *perchance* be done. And while we trust in God we shall still be owned and blessed, we patiently bear the reproach cast upon us, that "our unity is founded in alienating some from their ministers, who otherwise loved and honoured them for their work's sake; and those also who formerly took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company." † Though the Dr. seems entirely to forget that he is an Antiburgher, yet does any denomination refuse to accept, from other societies, those who chuse to join them? This notwithstanding, what sinister methods have we ever used to make proselytes to ourselves? What promises have we, at any time, held forth to allure? Or what unscriptural threats

* P. 87. † Ibid.

have

have we ever presumed to advance, "denouncing terrible things in that sort of righteousness, against any poor hoodwinked disciple, that we might have brought into a mean subjection, to our spiritual bar? And if by these our exertions, our Northern brethren should be the more liberated from spiritual tyranny, we truly shall not lament it; nor shall we less admire the pure and holy discipline of the word of God, by being delivered from those cruel fetters which, in so many instances, are perfectly the reverse of that law of love exhibited in the pure word of truth.

Some ideas on bigotry are among the last of the Dr.'s remarks *; and a few observations on this subject shall finish my annotations on his publication. "Give me leave, Sir," he observes, "to say, that to many, your zeal against bigotry seems to degenerate into the very principle you decry." Now to have proved the charge, I should have expected a definition of the crime; but not a word of this. I then shall attempt what he has omitted: I judge the bigot in religion is the man who conceives so well of himself, and of his party, as that even, in matters merely circumstantial, he will have no sort of connexion or intercourse with others. The Dr. asks, "Are all these (bigots, as I suppose them) dishonest men?" Then he accuses me of "judging their hearts †." Let the reader fairly determine, have I been endeavouring to expose the hypocrisy and wickedness, or the weakness, allowing notwithstanding the integrity which may yet possess the bigoted mind?

But the Dr. says I am a "bigot for liberality." The extremes of an evil, and its opposite good, are in me, it seems, conjoined. Did you ever

* Page 88. † P. 88.

hear

hear of a man who was villianously honest, or foolishly wise? ROWLAND HILL, the strangest phenomenon that was ever exhibited in the North, is a *liberal bigot;* or, "a bigot to liberality." An honest lawyer, a bigot to integrity! a good physician, a bigot to skill! a worthy magistrate, a bigot to good order! husbands and wives, bigots to chastity! children and servants, bigots to obedience! &c. &c.

I confess, after all, it is but a poor business, when a writer has only to expose his antagonist by criticisms like these; they are merely personal; and I am almost ashamed even of the short remarks made on many long pages of his pamphlet, just of the same description. I therefore hasten to lay before the reader, some general observations which have occurred to my mind in this controversy, and shall then conclude.

If I were inclined to be prolix, I might lead my Readers from the first existence of the Covenant, through all its wrathful consequences, so contrary to the mind of Christ, which have existed from the hour in which it was first forged on the anvil of war, to the present day. Till very lately, this flaming sword has been brandished with its double edge of political persecution and ecclesiastical excommunication. And though the design of the political clauses is now given up even by the Antiburghers themselves, yet they abide by that part of it, which directs them to a conduct the most hateful and intolerant; namely, the excommunication of all who do not chuse to adopt *their* sort

sort of reformation, or refuse to submit to these human Covenants.

Now, in what a labyrinth of inconsistencies do these good men involve themselves by this partial reformation! They must have discovered, that all their ancestors for above a century and a half, have been doing wrong in taking this Covenant, according to its persecuting design, while they have been excommunicating their brethren for doing right in renouncing them. Still, what remains must be taken, or the Antiburghers will have no sort of ministerial connexion with such delinquents. Thus, the most zealous and useful of the servants of God are to receive from them the greatest indignity and contempt which can be cast upon their ministry, with the additional stigma of excommunication even against their own members, should they presume to give such the least countenance by what they call "*promiscuous hearing*," by which sanctimonious pride a very sinful and dangerous example is set before the multitude, to neglect those means of grace provided by the mercy of God for their salvation.

Nor can it be esteemed a matter of great surprise, that Dr. Jamieson should have disgraced his learned pen by bringing forward quotations so preposterous and absurd, when he had to vindicate a cause like this: yet these, I am told, are only the common hackneyed arguments of the party whose cause he has engaged to vindicate and support.

And how can it be expected that a blessing should long rest on a people who attempt to curse those whom God has not cursed, and who keep at a distance from such as are brought near to him,

him, and whose ministers are made the honoured instruments of the salvation of many souls!

I believe the awful effects of these things have been acknowledged by many, even among the Antiburghers themselves; and they who are acquainted with the state of vital religion in the North will acknowledge, that a dependence upon these Covenants, and upon an outward form of church government, and a mere religious profession, without a serious attention to a work of grace upon the soul, has proved very fatal to the vital influences of the gospel in these parts.

For a long time past the Antiburghers have conceived the monopoly of religion to have been with them; and this has led them to a cruel and severe treatment of many eminent servants of God; speaking against the work of God itself, because carried on by others, in language very irreverent and profane: and the gross perversions that appear in the Dr.'s remarks, and the contemptuous style in which he speaks of those engaged among us, whereby his publication has met with so much of the esteem of the world, is a sufficient evidence that the same spirit still exists among them.

They cannot forget, that their treatment of Mr. Whitefield in particular, whom they most sinfully opposed, was immediately followed with the judgment of a terrible divison among themselves; and since that time, it is to be feared the Lord has awfully punished this spirit of division and separation, by leaving their churches in many places like Sardis, having a name to live while they are dead *.

* I have received this information of the internal state of their church from a very serious Christian, and late in the Antiburgher connexion.

While

While, therefore, the Dr. supposes I have gone too far in holding up the Seceders, as a body, to ridicule and contempt; on a closer investigation, as it relates to the internal state of their churches, had I said much more respecting the formal, lifeless spirit into which many of them are sunk, the fact had been too notorious to have been denied. Nor can it be a matter of surprise, under such existing circumstances, that many excellent characters which are still left in the Established Church, should stand aloof from the Secessions, notwithstanding the cruel and oppressive state of their government, arising from the conduct of the General Assembly. For how can they amend their state by changing their ground? the galling fetters forged by other sects, being equally offensive to the feelings of a liberal and upright mind.

Can then the Antiburghers, or any other society, restricted as they are by the rules which exist among them, wonder that such as are engaged in any new exertions, should choose to be at liberty from that spiritual tyranny which has so long and powerfully existed in the North?

I once more observe, that these remarks are not made on universal, but on general observation. Among every denomination, the Antiburghers not excepted, there are many excellent minds that are disgusted at the fetters they wear, while, from an affectionate regard to the people with whom they have been educated, they find themselves unwilling to renounce connexion with them.

Thus I have a second time given my solemn testimony against all that contractedness of spirit,

and pretended Christian discipline, whereby real Christians are separated from each other; and I am the more confirmed in the propriety of my views from the arguments of Dr. Jamieson, especially as quoted from Scripture, so that he shall be welcome to call me a "*bigot for liberality*," as long as he thinks proper.

A few observations on *Preaching*, and the *Style* of Preaching, shall be laid before the Public. It is generally supposed to be a great matter if a sermon costs the preacher a deal of time writing, and labour before it is delivered; while the old hackneyed idea is in the mouth of every dull man-made minister, of every party, that "we must not offer to the Lord that which costs us nothing;" and this perverted passage of Scripture is to cover the conduct of those who have presumed to enter into the ministry, without that holy aptitude to teach, required by the word of God, and who are to make up their deficiency by the mere dint of labour and application. This observation I hope I may be allowed to make, without being supposed to be an avowed enemy to erudition, or the standing ministry of the word.

Now, notwithstanding all the high language of the various priest-making denominations, as though wisdom and learning alone dwelt with them, and all besides were nothing better than barbarians, we will venture to assert, that all this artificial manufacturing for the ministry does infinite harm to the cause of real Christianity: such men as these never were designed by the Lord of the harvest for the sacred office, and hang as a dead weight upon the church. Holy zeal for the salvation

vation of souls can never be expected from them. Sinners are left to perish by thousands, while these men meanly submit to the impositions and limited restrictions of the parties to which they may belong. Their sermons also being the unnatural production of a burdened mind, are too frequently just the reverse of *the word of life*. When the glorious, animating, and enlivening truths of the gospel are put into a dry systematic form, instead of being "the savour of life unto life," spiritual death is engendered thereby, and comes in upon the congregation like a pestilence.

Had Dr. Jamieson duly considered the perfect inattention, and the slothful indecency, even to a degree of shameful stupor, which appears in the public assemblies of such preachers, he would have been less severe in his sarcastic censures on others, who conceive it as much their duty to affect and enliven the heart, as to enrich and illuminate the understanding. And while the Dr., in his ironic language, is pleased to speak of that "dull thing called a Sermon," yet if he, and his admirers of the Established Church, choose to approve of these "dull things," it may, with the Dr.'s and their leave, be left with us to admire somewhat more animated, and better calculated to do good to the people, and to judge that to be the *best* preaching after all, which best answers the end of preaching.

I have already mentioned to Dr. Jamieson one of his own denomination, who confessed how much we have been misunderstood by him. With his permission I will now give him an extract from the sentiments of another Antiburgher minister, which are before me, that the public may see that all the Antiburghers are not precisely like the Dr., but that some can see things

clearly, and state matters fairly, notwithstanding their prejudices of education and connexion.

" Dr. Jamieson," says my worthy friend, " seems to me, throughout his whole book, to have mistaken the real hinge of the controversy which he has entered into. The question is not, Whether a gospel ministry is a divine institution? nor whether human learning, when sanctified by grace, is really useful to a minister or not? for this is readily granted by all, and denied by none upon either side. But the question is, Whether, in such a season as this, when the schools of the prophets have been so long barren among all denominations in Scotland, that the people of God were beginning to despair of a succession of faithful, experienced gospel ministers; I say, whether in this case they are, by the word of God, absolutely confined to those that the clergy give us from their own seminaries? or whether, in case they find men of eminent parts, and eminent piety and experience, among themselves, that have not passed all the stages of secular learning, or been regularly bred at College, they may, nevertheless, take these, and get them *appointed over* them as ministers, rather than want the food of their souls, and a lively, spiritual, and searching ministry? Indeed, the modes of education in the best Divinity Halls in Scotland, are by no means calculated to teach men to be fishers of men. I speak from experience; and I know, and have known, sundry private men who are fitter to be ministers than most of us that have got a regular education."

Before I take leave of the Dr. on this part of the subject, I shall be free to remark, I wonder not that his new friends of the Established Church

and

and their General Assembly, should so admire his publication, it being so completely in the style of their own pastoral admonition, and general method of procedure. And I have a right, from the freedom the Dr. has taken with me, further to remind him, that this is not the first time his church has joined the Established Church in an opposition, somewhat at least, similar to this. I would humbly advise the Dr. therefore, if called to preach before their synod, to take the words of Dr. Gamaliel for his text——he knows where to find them, and on what occasion they were delivered.

I now conclude what I have to offer to the Dr., not with ill-natured sarcasms, or gross misrepresentations, but with an innocent conceit. We will suppose the Dr. called, from his present contracted sphere, to be Archbishop of Canterbury; not with the little scrap of power belonging to the Church of England, but with all that fulness of authority possessed by the Church of Scotland, and annually exercised in her General Assembly. How would matters then stand between us and his Grace, Dr. Jamieson, Primate of all England? Why, first, he would find his clergy very generally, though, thank God, *not universally*, ignorant, and grievously inattentive to their sacred office, and that, consequently, large districts are to be found entirely without "the word of life," and the people completely dissolute in their manners. In the midst of these nominal Christians, but real Heathens, one starts up in the style of a *Lay-Preacher*:---I suppose him to be a man of grace, good sense; and knows the meaning of his Bible, as to the grand leading truths of the gospel, as well as Archbishop Jamieson himself. Now, is this good man to be *mum*, and not to

open

open his Bible, and explain to these perishing souls the way of salvation by Jesus Christ, because he is called a *Layman?* If we are to be frighted at the formality of taking a text, and mounting a pulpit, for the sake of argument, we ask if he may not be allowed a humbler manner of doing the same thing? No, says the Archbishop; he must "plead with his mother." But she has provided them a priest already, who knows as much of the Bible as the Bible knows of the Solemn League and Covenant. Then he must plead "with other mothers:" they tell him, it is a reproach for any man to be ordained to the ministry till he has gone through a *regular course of education*, and has been taught to speak *Latin* and *Greek*, in order that he may learn to give a good *English* explanation how poor sinners are to be saved by the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ: insisting withal, that if he should presume to transgress the rules devised by any of these *holy church mothers*, as it may respect divers forms and modes, districts, &c. he is to be dealt with accordingly.

Now, I ask this most Rev. Archbishop Jamieson, if this holy, wise, and useful man may not tell his poor ignorant neighbours the way to heaven, without this *priestly parade?* and whether, after this good man has proved himself "a workman that need not be ashamed;" having collected by his holy, disinterested zeal, a company of serious Christians together, if a number of Presbyterian ministers, including one of each of the many denominations *thereunto belonging*, a liberal-minded Independent and Baptist, together with a "superstitious Episcopal," should all be conjoined in one mind and in one spirit, thinking precisely the same things, having no divisions

visions among them respecting the essentials of Christianity, only having some little shades of difference relative to the universally acknowledged non-essentials of church government---I ask, if these should all join as one, solemnly to set him apart as a minister of the gospel, where would be the transgression?

May I yet again propose to his Grace's consideration another case, not wholly dissimilar to the former?

There is a chapel under the care of a certain *superstitious Episcopal*, in London, who would be very happy to receive his Grace, as a preacher, provided he did not preach up the Covenant, and cry down Lay-Preaching. This *superstitious Episcopal*, being grieved to find himself in the midst of thousands and tens of thousands, dissolute and ignorant to an extreme, lately urged the necessity of vigorous exertions on behalf of the rising generation, to rescue them from being driven down the stream with their thoughtless and ungodly parents. The exhortation was attended with a very happy effect.

Some of his hearers, with much devotedness of spirit, formed themselves into a society, to seek after the children in their wretched haunts of wickedness. The *superstitious Episcopal* being perfectly convinced that they were all well capable of instructing these children, in child-like language, and of communicating the same sort of advice to their poor parents, almost as ignorant as their children, gave them all possible encouragement. The effect has exceeded expectation. These children, and their once dissolute parents, are brought into the habit

of

of public worship, and attend *only* where the gospel is preached. The *superstitious Episcopal* not having sufficient room in his chapel for these extra visitants, they were, to be sure, directed to commit the sin of "promiscuous hearing:" and the *superstitious Episcopal* being very happily blessed with several excellent and affectionate neighbours, both in the Established Church and out of it (he being a nondescript between every party), finds them all very friendly to the same excellent design. He finds also he can sleep very comfortably, tho' the near neighbour of the *real* Archbishop of Canterbury himself; under a full persuasion that he shall hear no thunders from the Established Church of England, nor yet such an humble echo from any body of dissenters, as has been heard against us by the Dr.'s denomination in the North.

But, alas! what severe discipline might we be led to expect from our *imaginary* Archbishop, with the above supposed powers of the General Assembly? Why, that every obsolete law should be raked out of the grave of oblivion, and that a persecution should commence as far as those laws can possibly be enforced.

But our worthy Antiburgher Dr. starts back again from his primacy, recoils at the idea of persecution, acknowledges that his new allies, whose cause, as it respects their opposition to Lay-Preaching and the Sunday Schools, is *preciesly the same* with his; yet in this they have gone too far, and that therefore the supposition was unjust; the Dr.'s denomination having formally renounced persecution three years ago, while others have renounced it a century before them; and now they mean to lay on all those who are "in subjection

subjection to them," nothing severer than the *gentle* rod of *excommnnication*, should they presume to give the least countenance to these irregular doings, or act contrary to their *mild* and *moderate* decree of 1799 *.

I now take leave of Dr. Jamieson, as it relates to the controversy before us. As I respect my Antagonist, I wish with all my heart, I had found him in better company; and that he had used a fairer pen respecting our real views in these matters. If he had more fully known many of those most useful and excellent men, against whose supposed irregular ministry his book bears so extremely hard, I believe he would have been less severe; nor yet is he aware of the melancholy result of his own doctrine, as thereby thousands would be deprived of the ministry of the word, and many a successful servant of God removed from an eminent sphere of usefulness†.

I now leave these thoughts on this very serious subject before the public, with one explanatory remark as it respects my former Publication. I see no reason to change the ground I then took, supposing that no express rule of church government was directly settled in the word of God; by these

* By the gentler laws of England, even the Bishops are directed to license dissenting places of worship, whenever and wherever the people may think proper to demand them.

† Since the above has been printed, upon further enquiry, I cannot absolutely assert, that the Dr. really went to Mass on the Fast day: that he intentionally committed the crime, I have from indubitable authority; knowing that he was positively engaged with a brother Antiburgher to give his attendance at the Popish Chapel; and which engagement he acknowledged, when asked to attend at some place of gospel worship on that day; that being the excuse why he could not accept the invitation of his friend. I write this that I may not be thought incautiously to accuse.

views I am bounden to be candid and affectionate to all who are willing to manifest the like spirit of candour and affection in return. It was against the bigot alone of every party that I levelled my feeble testimony.

Many in England, who wish to call themselves Independents, very different in several points of view from the *stricter* Independents of an earlier date, conceive that I have incautiously blended them with the more rigid of that denomination. It shall not be determined whether it was my incautious pen, or a little want of candour among these good people, which taught them to frame this conclusion. I still honestly confess it, even among the most liberal of this denomination, if there was a stronger bond of union than can, according to their discipline, subsist among them, I should conceive them in stricter alliance with the primitive church as evidently connected in those happier days.

I lament because that eminent servant of God Mr. Whitefield did not frame a liberal and open connexion of this description. I am grieved also, that the name of Independent has been introduced in many of the congregations raised by him, and by those in alliance with him; not that I less love them notwithstanding, but I prefer a connected government, such as under different forms have generally been adopted in the Christian church.

Let it still be admitted, that though I may believe the government of an Independent church may have in it a natural tendency to create a contracted spirit among its members, wherever the contrary appears, and blessed be God this is often

often the case, my heart is at once united to them, and they are ten times dearer to me than they whose church principles appear to be uniting in themselves, while their practice is just the reverse in their conduct towards their fellow-Christians of different societies.

I bless God that there is evidently an increasing spirit of Catholicism and Christian forbearance among the professors of real Christianity, both in the North and in the South. Oh that our liberty may be guarded from licentiousness, while we prove we are Christ's disciples because we love one another!

FINIS.

A. PARIS, Printer, Rolls'-Buildings, Fetter-Lane.

Just Published.

1. Mr. HILL'S FIRST JOURNAL of a Tour into the North, with Remarks on the present state of Religion in Scotland—on some Party Distinctions in England, and on *Lay* and *Itinerant-Preaching*, &c. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

2. Mr. HILLS' SECOND JOURNAL of a Tour through Scotland, 8vo. price 6d.

3. A SERIES of LETTERS, occasioned by the late *Pastoral Admonition* of the Church of Scotland. By R. HILL, A. M. 8vo. 8d.

4. DIVINE HYMNS for Children, designed as an Appendix to Dr. Watts's Divine Songs. By R. HILL, A. M. Price 6d.

5. INSTRUCTIONS FOR CHILDREN; or, a Token of Love for the Rising Generation. Second Edition, with Additions. By R. HILL, A. M. Price 6d.

Printed by A. PARIS, and Sold at Surry Chapel. also by T. WILLIAMS, Stationer's-court.

BRITISH
6 OC 81
MUSEUM

Also,

1. A VINDICATION of the Calvinistic Doctrines of Human Depravity, the Atonement, Divine Influences, &c. In a Series of Letters to the Rev. *T. Belsham*; occasioned by his Review of Mr. Wilberforce's Treatise. With an Appendix, addressed to the Author of "Letters on Hereditary Depravity." By THOMAS WILLIAMS, Author of the Age of Infidelity, &c. 8vo. 4s.

2. An HISTORIC DEFENCE of EXPERIMENTAL RELIGION: in which the Doctrine of *Divine Influences* is particularly considered, and supported by the authority of Scripture, and the experience of the wisest and best men in all ages and countries. By the Author of the last Article.

Sold by T. WILLIAMS, Stationers-court.